National Evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program: Final Report

Volume III
Findings From the 2003 Stakeholder Survey

Authors:

Roberta Cronin
Frances Gragg

December 30, 2004

Prepared for:

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20531

Prepared by:

WESTAT
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850
Contract No. 97-MU-MU-0005

WESTAT
AN EMPLOYEE-OWNED RESEARCH CORPORATION

National Evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program: Final Report

Volume III
Findings From the 2003 Stakeholder Survey

Prepared for:

Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20531

Prepared by:
WESTAT under contract no. 97-MU-MU-0005

December 30, 2004

Contents

Contents (continued)

List of Tables

List of Tables (continued)

1. Introduction and Overview

Overview of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Initiative

Many studies suggest that child abuse and neglect are risk factors for the development of juvenile delinquency and other problem behaviors.[1-7] The Safe Kids/Safe Streets (SK/SS) program is a Federal initiative designed to reduce delinquency through comprehensive, community-wide efforts to combat child abuse and neglect.

SK/SS is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs (OJP). Three offices within OJP—the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the Executive Office for Weed and Seed (EOWS), and the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)—fund and supervise the participating sites, with OJJDP providing overall coordination.

Five sites were selected to implement the SK/SS program, which began in 1997. The sites are varied, ranging from mid-sized cities (Huntsville, Alabama; Kansas City, Missouri; and Toledo, Ohio) to rural (Burlington, Vermont) and Tribal (Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan) areas. Initial awards for the first 18 months ranged from $425,000 for the rural and Tribal sites to $800,000 for Huntsville and $923,645 for Kansas City. Unlike the other sites, Toledo received only "seed money"—an award of $125,000 intended to encourage promising activities already underway in the community.

---

1 Kelley, B.T., Thornberry, T.P., & Smith, C.A. (1997). *In the wake of child maltreatment.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

2 Lemmon, J.H. (1999). How child maltreatment affects dimensions of juvenile delinquency in a cohort of low-income urban youths. *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 2, June, 357-76.

3 National Institute of Justice. (1995). *Childhood victimization and risk for alcohol and drug arrests.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

4 National Institute of Justice. (1996). *The cycle of violence revisited*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

5 Weeks, R., & Widom, C.S. (1998). *Early childhood victimization among incarcerated adult male felons*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

6 Widom, C.S. (1995). *Victims of childhood sexual abuse—Later criminal consequences. Research in Brief.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

7 Wiebush, R., Freitag, R., & Baird, C. (2001). *Preventing delinquency through improved child protection services.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Sites were eligible to receive the same amount each year for 4 more years. Actually, projects spent their awards at different rates, and all were still in operation as of June 2003. Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie were still using their fourth awards, while the remaining sites had spent most of their fifth awards.

In return for SK/SS support, participating communities were expected to:

- Restructure and strengthen their criminal and juvenile justice systems to become more comprehensive and proactive in helping children, adolescents, and their families who have been involved in abuse and neglect or are at risk;
- Implement or strengthen coordinated management of abuse and neglect cases by improving policy and practice in the criminal justice, juvenile justice, child welfare, family services, and related systems; and
- Develop comprehensive, community-wide, cross-agency strategies to reduce child and adolescent abuse and neglect and resulting child fatalities.[8]

OJP required the sites to develop and obtain approval for an implementation plan during their first award period.[9] Sites updated their plans as they applied for continued funding. From the outset, the implementation plans had to include four key elements or strategies:

- **System reform and accountability.** Sites were to reform policies, practices, and procedures across multiple systems and agencies to better identify and respond to child abuse and neglect and hold offenders accountable. Improvements in cross-agency training and communication were expected to be an important part of this strategy.
- **A continuum of services to protect children and support families.** Sites were to work to provide a full range of services and supports to children and families, ranging from prevention to treatment. In doing so, they were to explore ways to use existing services and resources more effectively, including public and private funding and informal support systems.
- **Data collection and evaluation.** Sites were to improve their information-sharing across systems and agencies and make data collection about child abuse and neglect cases more uniform, so as to facilitate decisionmaking in individual cases and case management. Sites also had to participate in the

[8] Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (July 1996). *Safe Kids/Safe Streets—Community approaches to reducing abuse and neglect and preventing delinquency*. FY 1996 discretionary competitive program announcements and application kit (p. 34). Washington, DC: Author.

[9] Because of its small award, Toledo was not required to conduct the extensive implementation planning mandated for the other sites.

national evaluation and conduct a local evaluation of their efforts, to ensure that community-wide objectives and outcomes were being met.

- **Public awareness and prevention education.** Using multiple media, sites were to educate the community about child abuse and neglect and how to report it, community services for children and families, and good parenting practices.

These strategies embody a commitment to cross-agency, multisystem approaches. Therefore, broad-based local collaborations were central to planning and carrying them out. The SK/SS collaboratives were expected to include agencies from the justice, child welfare, family service, education, health, and mental health systems, along with nontraditional partners such as religious and charitable organizations, community organizations, the media, and victims and their families. All sites began with some history of collaboration around child abuse and neglect, but SK/SS challenged them to raise collaboration to new levels—by including a broader range of partners and taking on a more ambitious, change-oriented agenda.

The grantee agencies and their staff provide leadership and support for the collaborations. Four of the five grantees are nonprofit organizations. The exception is Sault Ste. Marie, where a Tribal government agency of the Sault Sainte Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians takes the lead.

This Report

This report is one of several completed by Westat, the national evaluator of the SK/SS program, since the initiative began in 1997. It describes the third in a series of surveys designed to determine how collaboration members, or "stakeholders," feel about the SK/SS initiative and find out what roles they have actually played in it. This survey was conducted early in 2003, approximately 6 years after the initial SK/SS awards. Previous surveys, in 1998 and 2001, focused on stakeholders' views about and involvement in the planning process and in earlier stages of program implementation.

The current report forms Volume III of Westat's final evaluation of the SK/SS effort. Besides the Stakeholder Surveys, over the years Westat has used a variety of methods to study the process and impact of SK/SS. Evaluation staff visited each site about twice a year to conduct process interviews with staff, key stakeholders, and others in the community and to observe project activities such as forums or meetings. Westat also regularly reviewed project

documentation, budgets, and agency administrative data, such as statistics on reporting and investigation of child abuse and neglect. In 2000 and 2002, Westat conducted structured interviews with "key informants," targeting individuals who play key roles in the child protection system or are well placed to observe its operations. Finally, in 2002, we conducted a mail survey of agency personnel, targeting more mid-level and frontline staff. Previous reports covered evaluation findings through 2001 .[10-14] This volume and Volumes I, II, and IV of the final evaluation report describe more recent findings.

[10] Gragg, F., Cronin, R., Myers, T., Schultz, D., & Sedlak, A. (1999). *An examination of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets planning process: Year 1 final report for the national evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program.* Rockville, MD: Westat.

[11] Gragg, F., Cronin, R., Schultz, D., & Myers, T. (2000). *From planning to implementation: A Year 2 status report on the national evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program*. Rockville, MD: Westat.

[12] Gragg, F., Cronin, R., Schultz, D., & Eisen, K. (2001). *Year 3 status report on the implementation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program.* Rockville, MD: Westat.

[13] Gragg, F., Cronin, R., Schultz, D., & Eisen, K. (2002). *Year 4 status report on the implementation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program.* Rockville, MD: Westat.

[14] Cronin, R., & Gragg, F. (2002). *Implementation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program: Report on the Stakeholder Survey, year 3.* Rockville, MD: Westat.

2. The Third Stakeholder Survey

The third and final Stakeholder Survey, covering all five sites, was mailed in February 2003. The survey targeted collaboration members who had participated in implementation during the past 2 years.

Purpose of the Survey

The purpose of the third Stakeholder Survey was to systematically determine how stakeholders had been involved in SK/SS during the later phases of implementation, their experiences and reactions to the program, and their perceptions of the program's effects on their communities and their own organizations. The survey was also designed to identify characteristics of stakeholders who are most engaged and active and to help individual sites flag strengths and weaknesses from the perspective of their stakeholders.[15] Finally, the survey was intended to shed some light on changes over time in stakeholder characteristics and viewpoints, with the caveats noted below. All sites participated in the survey.

How the Survey Was Conducted

As in the first two surveys, all collaboration members who had served on project task forces, councils, or committees were eligible for the survey. Like the second survey, this survey also included representatives from organizations that had received SK/SS subgrants, if they were not among the committee members. Note that our definition of "stakeholder" for this survey is narrower than "collaboration member." All sites define their collaborations more broadly, to include people who have not had formal roles but have shown an interest in the program—by attending community meetings or joining its mailing list, for example.

The mailing list for the third Stakeholder Survey began with those who had been sent a survey in 2001. To this list we added individuals who had joined project teams or received grants since then, and we removed those who were known to have moved away or been inactive in SK/SS for at least 2 years. When in doubt about someone from the 2001 group, we left him or her on the list. We did not want to exclude anyone who might still be taking an interest in the project—by attending community meetings, for example—even though he or she

[15] Westat provides each site with its own survey results and, if requested, a dataset suitable for further analyses.

no longer served on a project team. However, the survey cover letter asked recipients who had been inactive for 2 years to return a blank survey, indicating that fact on the first page.

Westat mailed 486 surveys[16] in February 2003, with a cover letter promising that individual responses would be treated as confidential. We assigned ID numbers so that we could send reminders to nonrespondents and make limited comparisons between respondents and nonrespondents. Up to three reminders were sent if needed. As a result, 343 people, or 71 percent of the overall mailing list, responded. Across the sites, response rates ranged from 66 percent in Huntsville and 69 percent in Burlington to 72 percent in Kansas City, 74 percent in Sault Ste. Marie, and 75 percent in Toledo. The overall response rate was practically identical to that of the second Stakeholder Survey. Site-specific rates were similar as well, with response rates slightly higher than before for Huntsville and Kansas City and slightly lower elsewhere. Because 66 recipients responded that they had not been involved with the project during our 2-year target period, we ended up with 277 usable surveys, representing 57 percent of the survey mailing list.

The survey instrument included many items copied or adapted from the 1998 and 2001 surveys, along with a few new ones. While many items were the same, it is important to recognize that the respondent pool differed for the three periods. Thus, where responses to an item differed over time, we can only say that the current group of stakeholders feels differently from earlier groups. Although there was overlap between the respondents to the three surveys, we did not design the surveys to determine whether any individuals had changed their opinions.

In reporting results for the current survey, the tables routinely indicate differences in responses that are large enough to be statistically significant at the .05 level across sites. Such differences would be expected to occur by chance only 5 percent of the time.[17] Analytic techniques varied depending upon the data involved. Westat used two methods to make cross-site comparisons: (1) The chi-square statistic (χ^2) tests whether differences in the distribution of responses across sites were greater than one would expect by chance. Chi-square is commonly

[16] The original mailing went to 491 respondents. However, five respondents were later eliminated from the pool when we learned that they had moved away from the area, making them ineligible for the survey.

[17] The survey did not sample stakeholders, but was mailed to all those who met our criteria—that is, involvement in grants, councils, or task forces and possible activity during the last 2 years. Therefore, tests of significance are used exclusively to indicate whether differences among sites are greater than chance differences that might have occurred among respondents who were randomly assigned to subpopulations. The tests are not used to make statements about some larger population. (Blalock, H. (1972). *Social statistics.* New York: McGraw-Hill.)

used to compare categorical data, that is, data that fall into categories and have no numeric meaning or order. (2) Analysis of variance techniques (ANOVA) compare cross-site differences in means (or numerical averages) for responses that could be averaged, such as number of meetings attended or numerical ratings. The F-test was used to measure the significance of such differences. To measure the degree of association between responses to two items (such as opinions on two different questions), Spearman correlation coefficients (*r*) were used. This statistic can vary from –1 to +1, with a correlation of 0 indicating that there is no association between the variables. As Spearman's r increases toward 1, the ability to predict the response on one item from the response on the other increases. Generally, we do not discuss correlations unless they are at least .30 (positive or negative), even if they are statistically significant.

A more detailed description of the survey methodology and response rates, a copy of the questionnaire, and supplementary data tables are found in Appendices A, B, and C.

3. Findings From the Third Stakeholder Survey

This section describes the characteristics of the stakeholders, their involvement in and reactions to the implementation process, and their perceptions of the effects of the program on themselves, their agencies, and their communities. We also look at the relationships between stakeholder characteristics and experiences, their overall satisfaction with the implementation process, their satisfaction with accomplishments, and their plans to participate in the future.

In reviewing the data that follow, the reader should bear in mind that:

- Most tables display the survey results for both individual sites and the overall pool of respondents. Apparent differences across sites should be interpreted with caution, because many differences across sites could have occurred purely by chance in a group of this size. Typically, we do not discuss differences between sites unless they are large enough to be statistically or practically significant.

- Response rates for individual items differed considerably. In part, this reflects the diversity of the survey respondents , and the fact that not all questions applied to everyone. For example, items that asked respondents to characterize the effects of SK/SS on their "own organizations" or "clients" or "caseloads" would make little sense for some stakeholders, such as service clients or community members. On other items, some respondents may have felt that they lacked the knowledge to assess the project on some dimensions. We think these are the most likely explanations for the high rates of "no opinion" or missing responses on some items. Where applicable, we note such response issues in the footnotes to the tables.

- We do not display data from the previous surveys, although we refer to trends that appear noteworthy. Findings from the earlier surveys can be found elsewhere.[18-20]

- Sites were at different points in their implementation at the time of the survey. For Burlington, Huntsville, and Toledo, the end of Federal support was imminent, while Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie were expecting to operate for at least another year. This may have influenced respondents' satisfaction

[18] Gragg, Cronin, Myers, Schultz, & Sedlak, op. cit.

[19] Cronin & Gragg, op. cit.

[20] Toledo was not included in the first survey.

with the implementation process and their assessments of outcomes and accomplishments.[21]

What Are the Background Characteristics of the Stakeholders Who Participated in the Survey?

Year of First Involvement

Four out of five stakeholders who responded to the 2003 survey had been involved in SK/SS for 2 years or more. A substantial minority, 44 percent, had been involved since 1997 or 1998, the early years of the project. Just 6 percent had become involved in the past year. Huntsville and Toledo had the heaviest concentration of early participants, while Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie had the most new participants.

Agency Affiliations

OJP required that SK/SS collaboratives represent a broad spectrum of community agencies, including justice, child welfare, family service, education, health, and mental health, along with nontraditional groups such as community organizations, professional associations, business, and consumers. Our respondents reflect that requirement. As shown in Table 3-1 (top section), the majority (57%) came from public, government, or Tribal agencies, with private providers or other private agencies (26%) the next largest group. Stakeholders from "nontraditional groups" made up the remaining 17 percent of respondents. They included respondents from community or neighborhood organizations (8%); professional, civic, or religious groups (4%); and other groups, such as the business community, private foundations, parents, or youth (5%).

Of those who represented a public or private agency (bottom section of Table 3-1), 30 percent came from public or Tribal agencies with formal responsibilities for child protection, defined to include child protective services (CPS), law enforcement, family court, and prosecution. The balance of respondents came from agencies with other missions that ranged from education to youth services to working with victims of domestic violence.

[21] OJP subsequently offered Burlington, Huntsville, and Toledo the chance to apply for supplemental funds to ease the transition to non-Federal support. However, stakeholders were not aware of this when they completed the survey.

Table 3-1. Agency Affiliations of Respondents to Stakeholder Survey

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
What type of agency or group do you represent? (N)	(71)	(62)	(57)	(55)	(31)	**(276)**
Public or government agency (except Tribal)	39%	45%	51%	22%	61%	**42%**[d]
Tribal agency	0	0	0	75	0	**15**
Subtotal: Public	*39%*	*45%*	*51%*	*97%*	*61%*	***57%***
Private service provider or other private agency	51	24	19	0	35	**26**
Community or neighborhood organization	7	11	14	2	0	**8**
Professional, civic or religious organization	0	10	9	0	0	**4**
Other[1]	3	10	7	2	3	**5**
Subtotal: Nonpublic	*61%*	*55%*	*49%*	*4%*	*38%*	***43%***
If you represent a public or private agency, what type of agency is it? (N)	(64)	(47)	(47)	(40)	(29)	**(227)**
Child protective services	6%	4%	6%	8%	21%	**8%**[b]
Law enforcement	6	2	17	3	21	**9**
Family or juvenile court	5	9	15	10	10	**9**
Prosecution	2	4	4	5	7	**4**
Subtotal: Formal child protection	*19%*	*19%*	*42%*	*26%*	*59%*	***30%***
Family services	23	19	9	20	3	**16**
Education	9	19	2	18	7	**11**
Health	13	2	4	5	24	**9**
Mental health	11	9	11	8	3	**9**
Youth services	3	4	2	8	3	**4**
Other[2]	22	28	30	18	0	**21**
Subtotal: Other	*81%*	*81%*	*58%*	*75%*	*40%*	***70%***

[1] Includes respondents who checked parents (2), youth (1), private foundation (2), business community (5), or other (4).

[2] Includes respondents who identified themselves with domestic violence programs (9), neighborhood or community service agencies (9), housing-related programs (6), government not otherwise specified (6), corrections (2), criminal court (1), and miscellaneous others (21).

Significance levels of χ^2:

a = $p \leq .05$. c = $p \leq .001$.

b = $p \leq .01$. d = $p \leq .0001$.

Table 3-1 also shows the distinctive variations in the makeup of respondents at the site level. Burlington represents the only site where respondents from private providers/agencies outnumbered those from the public sector, and they did so by a considerable margin. Burlington, along with Huntsville, also had the lowest proportion of representatives from the formal child protection sphere—just 19 percent. In contrast, 59 percent of the Toledo respondents and 42 percent of the Kansas City respondents came from formal child protection agencies. Sault Ste. Marie was unusual in having *no* respondents from private agencies and a preponderance of respondents from Tribal agencies, reflecting the unique Tribal focus of this

project and the Tribe's dominant role in providing services to its members. However, despite the large proportion from Tribal and other public agencies, only 26 percent of the Sault Ste. Marie respondents came from the formal child protection arena. As for nontraditional respondents, Huntsville and Kansas City had by far the largest proportions—31 and 30 percent respectively—compared to 3 percent in Toledo, 4 percent in Sault Ste. Marie, and 10 percent in Burlington.

In previous comparisons of the 2001 and 1998 stakeholders, we had observed that the 2001 respondents were a more diverse group in terms of agency and group representation than the earlier respondents. In 2003, this trend toward greater diversification appears to have slowed or stopped. In 2003, respondents overall included slightly higher proportions from public or Tribal agencies and fewer with nontraditional affiliations. At the site level, the most striking changes occurred in Toledo, where the proportion of respondents from public agencies jumped from 38 percent in 2001 to 61 percent in 2003, while nontraditional respondents dropped from 20 percent to 3 percent.[22] Similar, but much less dramatic shifts occurred in Sault Ste. Marie and Burlington. Respondents from the nontraditional categories increased slightly in Kansas City and stayed about the same in Huntsville.

Level of Authority

Most respondents reported having considerable authority to make decisions on behalf of their organization at SK/SS meetings. (See Table 3-2.) On a 5-point scale ranging from 1, "no authority," to 5, "authority to commit agency resources/staff," 42 percent placed themselves at "5" and 22 percent at "4." The majority of respondents at all sites chose ratings of 4 or 5, suggesting that all the collaboratives have attracted a solid core of stakeholders with power and influence. However, there were statistically significant differences across sites, with the average ratings ranging from 3.3 in Sault Ste. Marie to 4.0 in Huntsville and Kansas City.

Comparing the site-specific ratings to those in 2001, we saw a noticeable improvement for Toledo, with the average authority rating climbing to 3.5 (from 2.9 before). In particular, far fewer respondents reported that they had *no* authority to make decisions (just 12% now vs. 29% before). Kansas City respondents also rated their authority level higher this

[22] As discussed in Appendix A, the mailing lists for the 2001 and 2003 survey differed. In Toledo and Sault Ste. Marie, they overlapped less than for the other sites. Toledo, in particular, had a larger proportion of public agency representatives on the mailing list in 2003.

Table 3-2. Decisionmaking Authority of Stakeholders

	Burlington (N=57)	Huntsville (N=55)	Kansas City (N=48)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=49)	Toledo (N=25)	**All Sites (N=234)**
What authority do you have to make decisions on behalf of your organization at SK/SS meetings?[1]						
1 None	12%	9%	8%	20%	12%	**12%**
2	7	5	6	14	16	**9**
3	18	9	17	14	12	**14**
4	25	25	15	18	32	**22**
5 Authority to commit agency resources/staff	39	51	54	33	28	**42**
Mean rating of authority	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.5	**3.7**[w]

[1] Percentages exclude 34 respondents who indicated that this question did not apply to them.

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.
x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

time around, with 54 percent of respondents now rating themselves a 5 compared to just 29 percent in 2001. In contrast, more Sault Ste. Marie respondents now said that they lacked authority to commit resources. The average rating of authority level declined from 3.7 in 2001 to 3.3 in this survey.

How Do the Stakeholders View the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Strategies?

As noted in our introduction above, the SK/SS program is built around four key elements or strategies—system reform and accountability, providing a full continuum of services to protect children and support families, data collection and evaluation, and public awareness/prevention education. As in the previous surveys, we asked stakeholders to rate the importance of these four strategies. This year, however, we introduced a wording change—naming the first element system reform instead of "reforming policies and procedures," as in previous years. While we generally kept the same wording from year to year to facilitate comparisons, we believed a change was necessary here. "Reforming policies and procedures" had come to seem too narrow to capture the full gamut of system reform activities envisioned by OJP and promoted through cluster conferences and technical assistance. Besides adopting system reform as the strategy label, we also added a new question that asked respondents to rate eight different dimensions of system reform, one of which was "reforming policies and procedures." The results are shown in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3. Stakeholder Ratings of Federal SK/SS Strategies and Dimensions of System Reform: Means

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Importance of federally promoted SK/SS strategies for your community (N)	(68-69)	(61-62)	(53-56)	(51-53)	(27-28)	**(263-267)**
Mean ratings of[1]						
Ensuring a full range of services is available, from prevention to treatment	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.4	**4.5**[x]
Enhancing public awareness	4.4	4.4	4.2	3.8	4.3	**4.2**[x]
Improving information systems and evaluation to guide decisionmaking	3.9	4.3	4.0	3.6	4.1	**4.0**[y]
System reform	4.0	3.9	4.2	3.5	3.4	**3.9**[y]
Importance of system reform dimensions (N)	(67-69)	(60)	(54-57)	(50-52)	(28-30)	**(262-266)**
Mean ratings of[1]						
Increasing communication and partnerships among professionals/ agencies	4.6	4.6	4.3	3.9	4.4	**4.4**[z]
Making the court process work more effectively	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.7	4.3	**4.2**[x]
Increasing family involvement in decisionmaking	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	**4.2**
Increasing the cultural competency of agencies and staff	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.9	**4.2**
Improving cross-disciplinary training and skills	4.3	4.3	3.9	3.9	4.1	**4.1**[w]
Increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement	4.0	4.4	4.3	3.8	3.8	**4.1**[y]
Increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.8	4.2	**4.1**[x]
Reforming policies and procedures	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.8	**3.8**

[1] Respondents ranked strategies on a 5-point scale, where "1" stands for "Not at all important" and "5" stands for "Extremely important." Response frequencies by site for each item are shown in Appendix Table C-1.

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.
x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

Looking first at the data in the top portion of Table 3-3, we find that stakeholders viewed all four strategies as important—awarding them overall ratings of 3.9 or better on a 5-point scale. Despite the wording change in 2003, the strategies were ranked the same and received similar ratings to previous years.

- "Ensuring that a full range of services is available for child abuse and neglect, from prevention to treatment" received the highest rating—4.5 overall.

- "Enhancing public awareness" ranked second with an overall rating of 4.2.
- "Improving information systems and evaluation to guide decisionmaking" ranked third with a rating of 4.0.
- "System reform" ranked last with a rating of 3.9.

Comparing the ratings of "system reform" in the top section of Table 3-3 with ratings of specific dimensions in the bottom section, we concluded that terminology really does matter. Although the overall ratings of "system reform" and "reforming policies and procedures" were practically identical (3.9 and 3.8), some stakeholders evidently saw them differently. In Toledo, stakeholders rated "system reform" lower on average than "reforming policies and procedures" (3.4 vs. 3.8), while Kansas City and Burlington rated "system reform" higher (4.0 vs. 3.8 in Burlington, 4.2 vs. 3.8 in Kansas City).

Also, we found that the average stakeholder was more enthusiastic about some dimensions of system reform than about the concept of "system reform" itself. Of the eight dimensions listed, "increasing communication and partnerships among professionals/agencies" received the highest rating, 4.4—almost as high as the rating for the top-rated program strategy, "ensuring that a full range of services is available." Six other dimensions of system reform—"making the court process work more effectively," "increasing family involvement in decisionmaking," "increasing the cultural competency of agencies and staff," "improving cross-disciplinary training and skills," "increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement," and "increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions"—all received average ratings of 4.1 to 4.2. Only "reforming policies and procedures" was rated less than 4 on a 5-point scale of importance—although some degree of policy and procedural reform seems integral to several of the higher rated system reform dimensions. Possibly both "system reform" and "reforming policies and procedures" were too generic to elicit the strongest support, without further clarification of *which* policies or systems.

Comparing the average ratings of SK/SS strategies and system reform dimensions across sites, we found statistically significant differences on most of the items. The exceptions were the system reform dimensions related to family involvement, cultural competency, and reforming policies and procedures. Where there were differences, Sault Ste. Marie stakeholders typically awarded the lowest ratings of importance, but tied with Toledo or Kansas City on one item each. At the other extreme, Kansas City stakeholders gave the highest ratings to "system reform," Burlington stakeholders gave the highest ratings to the services strategy, and

Huntsville stakeholders were the highest raters of the information systems/evaluation strategy. Huntsville and/or Burlington awarded the highest ratings on most other items in Table 3-3.

At the site level, we noted some interesting differences in the relative importance accorded the eight system reform dimensions. All sites except Sault Ste. Marie gave "increasing communication and partnerships among professionals/agencies" the highest rating of importance. The item receiving the second highest rating varied considerably, however. In Burlington, it was increasing cultural competency. In Huntsville, it was increasing the availability of data and, in Toledo, making the court process work more effectively. In Kansas City, increasing family involvement and increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement tied for first place with increasing communication and partnerships. In Sault Ste. Marie, the dimensions of increasing family involvement and increasing cultural competency tied for first place in the ratings.

Stakeholder ratings of the SK/SS strategies and system reform dimensions did not vary systematically according to the respondent's level of authority to decide for his or her agency. However, the type of agency represented by the respondent did make some difference. Repeating a pattern from 2001, overall, stakeholders from the formal child protection system (CPS, law enforcement, prosecutor, and court) tended to rate all four strategies as less important than other respondents. (See Appendix Table C-2.) The differences were statistically significant only for the information systems/evaluation strategy and the system reform strategy, however. Statistically significant differences also emerged on six of the eight system reform dimensions. Respondents from the formal child protection system thought all dimensions but "making the court process more effective" and "improving cross-disciplinary training" were less important than other stakeholders.

We also examined these relationships controlling for site. (See Appendix Table C-2.) Because of the small numbers involved, many site-level differences were not statistically significant. However, statistically significant differences consistently occurred in Huntsville and Sault Ste. Marie, where respondents from the child protection system awarded lower ratings of importance to the system reform strategy and to several of the system reform dimensions. In Kansas City, significant differences occurred only on increasing cultural competency, where respondents from the child protection system rated this system reform dimension of lower importance than other respondents.

In Burlington and Toledo, there were no statistically significant differences between stakeholders from the child protection system and other stakeholders. Comparing responses from 2001 and 2003, we noticed that Burlington and Toledo respondents from the child protection system rated the SK/SS strategies as more important this time, while the ratings by other types of respondents had not changed much. Thus, the two types of respondents appear to have converged in their views of the strategies. Whether stakeholders from the child protection system have actually changed their opinions or we got responses from a different pool of child protection stakeholders this time, we cannot say—possibly both factors played a role.

How Have These Stakeholders Been Involved in Safe Kids/Safe Streets?

We asked stakeholders several questions about their personal involvement in the implementation process and the time they had spent. We limited these questions to "the past year," assuming that recall would be more reliable if we limited the timeframe.

Types of Involvement in Safe Kids/Safe Streets

Respondents were asked whether they had been involved in seven different types of activities related to SK/SS, ranging from serving on the project's governing body to helping select groups to receive SK/SS funding. The average respondent was involved in at least two different ways. Only a few (7%) respondents checked none of the involvement items, while 19 percent checked four or more. (See Table 3-4.)

The most common types of involvement included attending community meetings held by the project (52% of all respondents), serving on the governing body (38%), and serving on another committee or task force (44%). Since our sample drew mostly from those who had served on a project team or council at some point, these percentages are not surprising. About one-third of all respondents said that they had helped implement project-funded activities in the past year. Respondents were much less likely to report involvement in developing training or other presentations (17%) or in writing proposals, plans, or other documents (13%). Just 7 percent had helped to select groups to receive funding.

Table 3-4. Types of Stakeholder Involvement in SK/SS in the Past Year

	Burlington (N=71)	Huntsville (N=62)	Kansas City (N=57)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=55)	Toledo (N=31)	**All Sites (N=276)**
In the past year, what kind of involvement have you had in SK/SS?[1]						
Attended community meetings convened by the project	54%	58%	46%	42%	68%	**52%**
Served on the SK/SS governing body	37	34	47	22	65	**38**[c]
Served on another committee, team, or task force	49	52	16	49	61	**44**[d]
Implemented activities funded by SK/SS	32	31	21	40	42	**32**
Helped develop training or made presentations	14	16	12	24	19	**17**
Helped write proposals, plans, or other documents	11	10	11	7	35	**13**[b]
Helped select groups to receive funding	10	6	11	0	6	**7**
Other involvement	10	13	9	15	3	**11**
Number of types of involvement[2]						
None	6%	5%	7%	13%	3%	**7%**
1	34	40	49	31	29	**37**
2	24	16	26	24	13	**21**
3	15	16	11	20	16	**16**
4	17	16	2	5	19	**12**
5-7	4	6	5	7	19	**7**
Mean[3]	2.2	2.2	1.7	2.0	3.0	**2.1**[x]

[1] Responses do not add to 100% because respondents could choose multiple answers.
[2] This represents a count of the number of types of involvement, based on the items reported above. The maximum value is 8, if a respondent reports every type of involvement; however, no respondent reported more than 7 types of involvement.
[3] The mean is the arithmetical average of all responses.

Significance levels of χ^2:
a = $p \leq .05$.
b = $p \leq .01$.
c = $p \leq .001$.
d = $p \leq .000.1$

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$.
x = $p \leq .01$.
y = $p \leq .001$.
z = $p \leq .0001$.

There were statistically significant differences across sites for three types of activities—serving on the SK/SS governing body, implementing activities funded by SK/SS, and involvement in writing proposals or other documents. Toledo respondents were the most involved in all three, with 65 percent serving on the governing body, 61 percent helping to implement SK/SS activities, and 35 helping to write proposals, plans, or other documents. They also participated in the most different types of activities—3.0 on average—while Sault Ste. Marie and Kansas City stakeholders were the least likely to participate in a variety of activities, averaging 2.0 and 1.7 types of involvement respectively. For Toledo, this represented a noticeable increase in activity levels over 2001, when respondents averaged 2.3 types of

involvement. In Kansas City, however, the average number of types of involvement had decreased compared to 2001 (from 2.1), and participation in committees, implementation of SK/SS-funded activities, and training development were all noticeably lower. In Sault Ste. Marie, the primary change was in the mix of activities. While respondents were much less likely to be involved in the governing council in 2003 (22% vs. 44% before), they were more likely to be involved in implementing SK/SS activities (40% vs. 29%) and preparing proposals or other documents (24% vs. 6%). Patterns of involvement in the other two sites, Burlington and Huntsville, were similar to those reported in 2001.

Quantity of Involvement in Safe Kids/Safe Streets

We also asked respondents to quantify their involvement by estimating the number of meetings they had attended in the past year and the number of hours they spent per month on SK/SS, excluding time spent implementing SK/SS subgrants. (See Table 3-5.)

As in the previous surveys, time commitments varied widely. About 9 out of 10 respondents reported spending at least some time monthly on the project. The mean time commitment per month was 5.1 hours; however, this figure is somewhat misleading, as it is affected by a handful of respondents who reported extremely high time commitments (including one person reporting 100 hours). Just a small group (19%) spent 6 or more hours per month. The typical respondent spent about 2 to 3 hours a month, as reflected in the overall median and the medians for each site.[23] Differences across sites were not statistically significant.

Respondents also varied in their meeting attendance, with 11 percent reporting no meetings in the past year, while almost a fourth attended at least 12 meetings—in other words, one meeting a month or more. The median response was 5 meetings, and the mean was 8.5 meetings. As with the report of hours spent, the mean is affected by a few extreme values, including 12 respondents who reported 25 meetings or more.[24] The cross-site differences in mean and median number of meetings attended were statistically significant. Toledo and Burlington's respondents averaged the most meetings. Median involvement levels were not

[23] The median is the midpoint of all responses, when they are put in order from lowest to highest. It provides an alternative way to look at the typical or average response in situations where the mean (the arithmetical average) is strongly affected by a few respondents who have reported very low or very high numbers.

[24] It is puzzling that 11 or 12 percent of the respondents reported no meetings or hours spent, while just 7 percent reported no involvement (in Table 3-4). We looked more closely at individual responses to these and related items, but cannot explain this anomaly.

Table 3-5. Time Contributions of Stakeholders to SK/SS in the Past Year

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Number of hours per month spent on SK/SS, excluding time implementing grants (N)	(69)	(58)	(54)	(48)	(29)	**(258)**
None	9%	12%	9%	21%	14%	**12%**
1 or fewer hours	20	21	28	19	17	**21**
2 hours	19	26	22	10	21	**20**
3-5 hours	33	22	24	29	24	**27**
6-10 hours	14	10	9	10	21	**12**
11 hours or more	4	9	7	10	3	**7**
Range	0-60	0-50	0-60	0-100	0-20	**0-100**
Mean hrs.[1]	4.6	5.0	4.3	7.1	4.1	**5.1**
Median hrs.[2]	3	2	2	2.5	2	**2**
Number of meetings attended in past year (N)	(67)	(61)	(53)	(51)	(29)	**(261)**
None	4%	11%	9%	22%	10%	**11%**
1-3 meetings	18	25	32	29	17	**25**
4-6 meetings	19	23	45	24	10	**25**
7-11 meetings	16	23	9	14	14	**16**
12-16 meetings	19	13	0	2	17	**10**
17-24 meetings	13	2	4	10	17	**8**
25 meetings or more	9	3	0	0	14	**5**
Range	0-30	0-120	0-20	0-24	0-100	**0-120**
Mean no.[1]	10.5	8.1	4.3	5.4	17.7	**8.5[z]**
Median no.[2]	8	5	4	3	10	**5[d]**
In the past year, how difficult was it for you to make time to participate in the SK/SS program? (N)	(66)	(60)	(54)	(51)	(28)	**(259)**
1 Not at all difficult	18%	18%	24%	12%	21%	**19%**
2	24	18	24	18	25	**22**
3	27	35	31	37	32	**32**
4	27	13	11	24	11	**18**
5 Extremely difficult	3	15	9	10	11	**9**
Mean rating[1]	2.7	2.9	2.6	3.0	2.6	**2.8**

[1] The mean is the arithmetical average of all responses.

[2] The median is the midpoint of all responses, when they are put in order from lowest to highest. It provides an alternative way to look at the typical or average response in situations where the mean is strongly affected by a few respondents who have reported very low or very high numbers.

Significance levels of χ^2:
a = $p \leq .05$.
b = $p \leq .01$.
c = $p \leq .001$.
d = $p \leq .0001$.

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$.
x = $p \leq .01$.
y = $p \leq .001$.
z = $p \leq .0001$.

much different than in 2001, except that Sault Ste. Marie respondents reported attending fewer meetings (3 per year in 2003 vs. 6 in 2001) and Toledo respondents reporting attending more (10 vs. 4).

Difficulty of Making Time To Participate

Continuing the pattern from previous years, most respondents (59%) reported at least some difficulty making the time to participate in SK/SS, rating the difficulty at "3" or higher on a 5-point scale. Ratings did not differ significantly across sites.

We also looked at the relationship between the difficulty of finding time to participate and other measures of involvement. None of the overall correlations with other measures were very large, but as one might expect, those who found it more difficult to participate tended to spend fewer hours per month on SK/SS (Spearman's $r=-.21$, $p\leq.001$) and attended fewer meetings per year ($r=-.23$, $p\leq.001$).

How Have the Respondents' Organizations Been Involved in Safe Kids/Safe Streets?

Besides exploring personal involvement in SK/SS, we asked how the respondent's agency or group had been involved in SK/SS—specifically, whether the organization had received any SK/SS funds, had contributed any staff or money, or ever had a proposal rejected by the project. (See Table 3-6.)

More than a third of all respondents (37%) represented an organization that had received SK/SS funding at some time. Just 7 percent represented groups that had ever had a SK/SS proposal rejected. Interestingly, most of those who reported a proposal rejection (72%) also reported that their organization had received funds from SK/SS. In contrast to 2001, sites did not differ significantly on these measures.

As in 2001, half the respondents said that their organization had assigned or contributed staff to SK/SS activities. This proportion was similar across sites. Staffing contributions were more common among the organizations that had received SK/SS funding. Seventy percent of respondents from funded organizations said that their organization had assigned or contributed staff compared to 38 percent of those from organizations that had never

Table 3-6. Involvement of Stakeholder Organizations in SK/SS

	Burlington (N=68)	Huntsville (N=60)	Kansas City (N=54)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=54)	Toledo (N=29)	**All Sites (N=265)**
Proportion of stakeholders reporting that their agency or organization ever: [1]						
Received any SK/SS funds	46%	32%	41%	24%	41%	**37%**
Assigned/contributed staff to conduct activities	47	47	52	52	55	**50**
Provided financial support to SK/SS	25	5	9	11	21	**14**[b]
Had a proposal for SK/SS rejected	10	3	11	2	7	**7**

[1] Responses do not add to 100% because respondents could choose multiple answers.

Significance levels of χ^2:
a = $p \leq .05$. c = $p \leq .001$.
b = $p \leq .01$. d = $p \leq .0001$.

received funds. This is consistent with our on-site observations, which suggested that SK/SS funding often involved participation in SK/SS committees, training, or other activities. In fact, in Burlington, the project made it a formal requirement for grantees to join the project's Operations Team. And in Kansas City, grantees met regularly with the project director and local evaluator to discuss administration, reporting, and evaluation.

On average, respondents from organizations that had received project funds attended more meetings and reported more different types of involvement in SK/SS than other respondents. Oddly, though, they did not report spending significantly more hours per month on SK/SS.[25] In general, recipients of SK/SS funds differed less from other stakeholders in their level of involvement in 2003 than they had in 2001.

While contributions of time to SK/SS were common, just 14 percent of respondents reported that their organizations had contributed money. Even so, this was more than double the percentage for 2001. Cross-site differences on this item were statistically significant, with considerably more respondents reporting financial contributions in Burlington (25%) and Toledo (21%) than in the other sites.[26]

[25] Within sites, most of the differences were not statistically significant. At some sites, they sometimes ran counter to the general pattern. In Kansas City, for example, those who received funds were slightly less involved on all three measures. See Appendix Table C-3 for further details.

[26] The survey did not ask about the size or purpose of any financial contributions, so we are unable to elaborate on what the contributions entailed.

How Satisfied Are Stakeholders With the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Implementation Process?

Satisfaction With Leadership, Communication, and Decisionmaking

One purpose of surveying stakeholders was to determine how they felt about the implementation process and the decisions that had resulted from it. We began by asking stakeholders to rate SK/SS on several dimensions, including the grantee's leadership, communication, the convenience of meeting times, the decisionmaking process, and the decisions made in the past year. The items were identical to those used in the 2001 survey, except for one addition—a rating of satisfaction with "decisions about how and what aspects of SK/SS will be sustained." Respondents used a 5-point scale, where 1 represented "not at all satisfied" and 5 represented "extremely satisfied." (See Table 3-7.)

As in 2001, stakeholders overall appeared quite satisfied with the implementation process. Grantee leadership, advance notice for meetings, and communication between staff and SK/SS participants received the highest average ratings overall—4.3 or 4.2 on a 5-point scale. But the range in average ratings was fairly small—the lowest rating was 3.8 for satisfaction with decisions about how and what aspects of SK/SS to sustain.

The analyses revealed significant cross-site differences in satisfaction levels in all areas. As in 2001, Sault Ste. Marie respondents consistently reported the lowest satisfaction levels. As before, Huntsville respondents often represented the high end of the ratings, but this time Burlington's ratings were as high or higher on some items. Kansas City respondents were the most satisfied of all with the advance notice for meetings and the convenience of meeting times.

In 2001, we observed that stakeholder ratings of satisfaction had increased noticeably on several items when compared with responses in 1998. In 2003, the changes were not as striking or consistent. Satisfaction levels changed only slightly at three of the sites—trending slightly upward on most items in Sault Ste. Marie and Toledo, but showing no consistent direction in Huntsville. In Burlington and Kansas City, however, the 2003 respondents appeared distinctly more satisfied than those in 2001. Ratings increased on every item, sometimes substantially. For example, ratings of satisfaction with leadership and with communication among the SK/SS participants were a full half-point higher at both sites; ratings

Table 3-7. Stakeholder Assessment of the SK/SS Implementation Process in the Past Year

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Mean ratings of satisfaction with [1,2](N)	(40-67)	(39-61)	(43-50)	(34-47)	(20-26)	**(183-250)**
Leadership and communication						
Leadership provided by the SK/SS grantee and staff	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.8	4.2	**4.3[y]**
Advance notice for meetings	4.5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.3	**4.3[z]**
Communication between project staff and other SK/SS participants	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.7	4.3	**4.2[x]**
Communication among SK/SS participants	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.9	**3.9[w]**
Convenience of meetings						
Convenience of meeting times	3.8	4.0	4.3	3.5	4.0	**3.9[x]**
Decisionmaking process						
The process for deciding on SK/SS programs and priorities	4.1	4.4	3.9	3.4	3.8	**3.9[x]**
Decisions made						
Decisions made on SK/SS priorities	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.9	**4.0[w]**
Decisions made about which programs to fund	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.4	4.0	**4.0[x]**
Decisions about how and what aspects of SK/SS will be sustained	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.2	3.9	**3.8[y]**
No. of areas of dissatisfaction mentioned[3] (N)	(68)	(61)	(53)	(48)	(27)	**(257)**
None	84%	85%	77%	63%	85%	**79%**
1	10	10	8	15	11	**11**
2-5	4	3	8	13	4	**6**
6-9	1	2	8	10	0	**4**
Mean number of areas of dissatisfaction	.3	.3	.9	1.3	.2	**.6[x]**

[1] Respondents rated satisfaction on a 5-point scale, where "1" was defined as "Not at all satisfied" and "5" as "Extremely satisfied." Frequencies by site are shown in Appendix Table C-4.

[2] Note that many respondents skipped these items or indicated that they had "no opinion." Nonresponse rates ranged from a low of 10% on the rating of satisfaction with leadership by the grantee to 34% on the rating of decisions about which aspects of SK/SS to sustain.

[3] Represents the number of items rated "1" or "2" on the 5-point satisfaction scale. The maximum value is 9, if a respondent is dissatisfied on all areas.

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.
x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

of satisfaction with decisions on SK/SS priorities also jumped a half-point in Burlington and .4 in Kansas City.

We also looked at the satisfaction items in another way—by counting the number of implementation items on which a stakeholder had expressed dissatisfaction. (See bottom section of Table 3-7.) We defined dissatisfaction as a rating of 1 or 2 on a given item. The data

revealed that 79 percent of stakeholders were not dissatisfied with SK/SS on *any* dimension. Another 11 percent had only one complaint. The remaining 10 percent had two or more complaints. Most of the respondents with two or more complaints came from Sault Ste. Marie or Kansas City. The cross-site differences in average number of complaints were statistically significant.

In most respects, dissatisfied respondents did not seem very different from other respondents. They did report slightly less involvement in SK/SS committees and community meetings and more difficulty finding time to participate. They also were somewhat more likely than other respondents to say that SK/SS could do something to make their participation easier, although their specific suggestions for making participation easier were similar to those of other respondents. About one in five survey respondents (44 in all) suggested ways to make their participation easier. Eighteen respondents made a suggestion related to meeting times, notice, or length of meetings, and nine made some suggestion about providing better communication or followup. The respondents did not mention any other themes consistently.

Satisfaction With Investments in the Implementation Process

The survey also asked stakeholders to rate several other aspects of the implementation process, which we characterize broadly as "investments" in the process. We asked about the adequacy of the time the respondent and the respondent's organization had invested, the resources available to SK/SS, the data available, the effort spent on strategic planning, the guidance from Federal sponsors, and the amount and diversity of participation by various groups. Respondents ranked each item on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 for "Not enough" to 5 for "Too much." The midpoint of the scale, 3, was labeled "About right." Strictly speaking, respondents who chose "About right" for an item were the only ones fully satisfied.

To simplify the presentation, we have combined responses 1 and 2 under the label "Not enough" and responses 4 and 5 under the label "More than enough."[27] (See Table 3-8.) Note that response rates varied considerably by item (as reflected in the Ns).

[27] Since few respondents chose the extreme of 5, "Too much," we felt that "More than enough" was the most accurate label for 4 and 5 combined.

Table 3-8. Stakeholder Assessments of Adequacy of Investments in SK/SS in the Past Year (Year 4)

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Thinking of the past year of SK/SS, how did you feel about the: [1, 2]						
Amount of time you yourself contributed (N)	(67)	(60)	(55)	(53)	(28)	**(263)**
1 Not enough	34%	35%	27%	43%	29%	**34%**
3 About right	57	57	64	47	61	**57**
5 More than enough	9	8	9	9	11	**9**
Mean rating[3]	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.7	**2.6**
Amount of time your agency or organization contributed (N)	(59)	(58)	(51)	(53)	(26)	**(247)**
1 Not enough	19%	19%	16%	28%	19%	**20%**
3 About right	68	72	71	60	69	**68**
5 More than enough	14	9	14	11	12	**12**
Mean rating[3]	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.7	2.9	**2.9**
Amount of resources available to SK/SS (N)	(59)	(56)	(52)	(45)	(27)	**(239)**
1 Not enough	58%	41%	42%	29%	22%	**41%**
3 About right	39	50	44	53	63	**48**
5 More than enough	3	9	13	18	15	**11**
Mean rating[3]	2.2	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.8	**2.6**[x]
Amount of data available to guide decisions (N)	(56)	(56)	(49)	(46)	(27)	**(234)**
1 Not enough	23%	18%	18%	28%	37%	**24%**
3 About right	64	66	67	65	52	**64**
5 More than enough	13	16	14	7	11	**12**
Mean rating[3]	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.7	**2.8**
Amount of effort spent on strategic planning (N)	(53)	(53)	(53)	(48)	(27)	**(234)**
1 Not enough	17%	11%	17%	17%	30%	**17%**
3 About right	70	72	66	56	56	**65**
5 More than enough	13	17	17	27	15	**18**
Mean rating[3]	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.8	**3.0**
Amount of guidance and technical assistance from Federal sponsors (N)	(40)	(53)	(47)	(43)	(25)	**(208)**
1 Not enough	33%	23%	11%	16%	44%	**23%**
3 About right	50	68	83	74	48	**67**
5 More than enough	18	9	6	9	8	**10**
Mean rating[3]	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.6	**2.8**
Amount of involvement by professionals and agencies (N)	(60)	(58)	(54)	(50)	(28)	**(250)**
1 Not enough	18%	14%	11%	22%	25%	**17%**
3 About right	70	69	69	62	68	**68**
5 More than enough	12	17	20	16	7	**15**
Mean rating[3]	2.9	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.8	**3.0**

Table 3-8. Stakeholder Assessments of Adequacy of Investments in SK/SS in the Past Year (Year 4) (continued)

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Amount of community involvement (N)	(55)	(60)	(50)	(48)	(26)	**(239)**
1 Not enough	44%	27%	24%	44%	58%	**37%**
3 About right	47	57	62	46	35	**51**
5 More than enough	9	17	14	10	8	**12**
Mean rating[3]	2.5	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.4	**2.7[w]**
Cultural/ethnic diversity of participants in SK/SS (N)	(57)	(58)	(54)	(48)	(27)	**(244)**
1 Not enough	58%	12%	19%	15%	41%	**28%**
3 About right	39	69	63	67	48	**58**
5 More than enough	4	19	19	19	11	**14**
Mean rating[3]	2.3	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.6	**2.8[z]**

[1] Except for the first item ("Amount of time you yourself contributed"), 10 percent or more of the respondents declined to answer some items reported in this table. Nonresponse rates varied from 10 percent for the ratings of "Amount of involvement by professionals and agencies" to 25 percent for the rating of "Amount of guidance and technical assistance from Federal sponsors."

[2] Respondents ranked these items on a 5-point scale, ranging from "1" for "Not enough" to "5" for "Too much." The midpoint, "3," was labeled "About right." To simplify the presentation of percentages, response categories have been combined: responses 1 and 2 are combined under the label "Not enough" and responses 4 and 5 have been combined under the label "More than enough." Note that few respondents chose the extreme of 5, "too much," in responding to these items; therefore, we elected to use a less extreme label for the category combining 4 and 5.

[3] Calculated using the full 5-point scale.

Significance levels of F:

w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.

x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

About two-thirds of all respondents felt that the level of investment had been "about right" in most of the areas shown in Table 3-8. These included the time the respondent's agency had contributed (68%), the amount of involvement by professionals and agencies (68%), the amount of guidance and technical assistance from Federal sponsors (67%), the effort spent on strategic planning (65%), and the amount of data available to guide decisions (64%). Smaller majorities were satisfied with the cultural/ethnic diversity of participants (58%), the time they personally had contributed (57%), and the amount of community involvement (51%). These levels of satisfaction are consistently higher on all items than those reported in 2001.

There is only one area where satisfaction levels are lower than in 2001—the amount of resources available to SK/SS. Only 48 percent of stakeholders felt that resources had been about right over the past year (down slightly from 52%).

On most items, stakeholders who were not completely satisfied were more likely to say that the investment had been too little rather than too much. There were a couple of exceptions, however. About the same proportions of respondents said that the effort on strategic planning had been more than enough (18%) or too little (17%). Similarly, ratings of the involvement by professionals and agencies split fairly evenly between not enough (17%) and more than enough (15%).

Analysis of variance revealed cross-site differences on three of the nine items. As in 2001, the most significant differences occurred on the ratings of cultural/ethnic diversity. Burlington and Toledo respondents expressed much less satisfaction with the cultural or ethnic diversity of their participants than their counterparts elsewhere. Interestingly, though, the proportion of respondents who felt there had not been enough diversity declined in Burlington (from 71% in 2001 to 58% now), while it increased in Toledo (from 33% to 41%). Burlington and Toledo respondents, along with those from Sault Ste. Marie, were also more likely to feel that community involvement had been inadequate. On this item also, the trends for Burlington and Toledo were in opposite directions, with dissatisfaction declining in Burlington (from 64% to 44%) and increasing in Toledo (from 41% to 58%). Those who thought there had been insufficient community involvement also declined in Kansas City (from 40% to 24%). The proportions in Sault Ste. Marie and Huntsville were about the same as before, however.

The only other cross-site difference occurred for ratings of the amount of resources available. Burlington respondents were the most likely to report that resources had been insufficient (58%), while respondents from Toledo—the site that received the least SK/SS funding—were the least likely to say so (22%). In contrast to 2001, there were no significant cross-site differences in ratings of the personal time contributed, the time the respondent's organization had contributed, and the amount of strategic planning. In 2001, Kansas City stood out for having a substantial minority of stakeholders (40%) who felt that the strategic planning efforts had been insufficient, but in 2003 just 17 percent felt this way—the same proportion as in the overall sample.[28]

---

[28] Note that the items shown in Table 3-8 do not capture the *actual* level of investments, only stakeholder perceptions of their adequacy. The only measures of actual investments included in the survey—hours spent and meetings attended by the respondent—pertain to the first item in the table, the adequacy of personal time contributed. Looking at the associations between these measures, we found that overall, stakeholders who reported more hours of involvement per month and more meetings in the past year were more likely to report that their involvement had been about right or too much ($r=.34$, $p\leq.0001$ with hours; $r=.35$, $p\leq.0001$ with meetings). These relationships also were statistically significant at the site level in Burlington, Huntsville, and Toledo. However, neither was significant for Kansas City, and only the relationship to number of meetings held for Sault Ste. Marie.

Stakeholder Influence Over the Direction of Safe Kids/Safe Streets

Finally, we asked stakeholders to assess two other dimensions of implementation—the openness of SK/SS to different points of view and the ability of collaborative members to influence goals and objectives, funding decisions, and program operations.

As shown in Table 3-9, these respondents believe SK/SS is quite open to different points of view—nearly 80 percent gave the program a rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale. Average ratings were high everywhere (3.9 and up). In contrast to 2001, ratings of openness did not differ significantly across sites, and everywhere but Huntsville (where previous ratings were already quite high), the average ratings went up. The ratings increased the most in Burlington and Kansas City, by .4 and .3, respectively.

Respondents also rated their influence on overall goals and objectives as fairly high, awarding an average rating of 3.8 on a scale ranging from 1, "no influence at all," to 5, "a great deal of influence." Influence over funding decisions and program operations were rated somewhat lower, at 3.4 and 3.5 respectively. As in 2001, cross-site differences emerged on these three items, with Sault Ste. Marie stakeholders again reporting the lowest levels of influence. Burlington stakeholders consistently reported the highest influence levels, with Huntsville's averages equaling Burlington's on two of the three items. For the most part, responses to these items were similar to those in 2001. However, average ratings of influence over goals and objectives jumped by .5 in Kansas City, and ratings of influence over program operations went up by .4 in Burlington.

We expected that respondents who gave SK/SS high marks on openness and those who felt that stakeholders had influence over the program would also be the most satisfied with the implementation process. That was the case for all of the satisfaction items shown in Table 3-7 above, including leadership and communication, convenience of meeting times, the decisionmaking process, and the decisions made. Many correlations were quite strong, exceeding .50 ($p \leq .0001$) in the overall sample. These relationships usually were strong at the site level as well. In contrast, ratings of openness and influence were not strongly or consistently related to opinions about the adequacy of the investments reported in Table 3-8.

Table 3-9. Stakeholder Ratings of Influence Over SK/SS

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
How open is SK/SS to considering different points of view? (N)	(68)	(59)	(56)	(51)	(28)	**(262)**
1 Not at all open	1%	0%	5%	2%	0%	**2%**
2	3	3	5	8	7	**5**
3	13	14	9	20	21	**15**
4	35	37	41	43	39	**39**
5 Extremely open	47	46	39	27	32	**40**
Mean rating	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.9	4.0	**4.1**
How much influence do you feel have over:						
Overall goals and objectives (N)	(61)	(57)	(56)	(51)	(27)	**(252)**
1 No influence at all	2%	0%	4%	8%	4%	**3%**
2	3	4	5	16	0	**6**
3	20	23	30	25	30	**25**
4	41	40	29	39	48	**38**
5 A great deal of influence	34	33	32	12	19	**27**
Mean rating	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.3	3.8	**3.8**[y]
Funding decisions (N)	(59)	(57)	(56)	(51)	(27)	**(250)**
1 No influence at all	5%	5%	7%	14%	11%	**8%**
2	8	9	13	20	11	**12**
3	27	30	29	43	33	**32**
4	39	35	30	16	22	**30**
5 A great deal of influence	20	21	21	8	22	**18**
Mean rating	3.6	3.6	3.5	2.8	3.3	**3.4**[x]
Program operations (N)	(59)	(57)	(56)	(51)	(27)	**(250)**
1 No influence at all	5%	2%	7%	10%	4%	**6%**
2	3	14	13	20	4	**11**
3	25	23	27	29	33	**27**
4	42	40	32	31	37	**37**
5 A great deal of influence	24	21	21	10	22	**20**
Mean rating	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.1	3.7	**3.5**[w]

Significance levels of F:
w = p ≤ .05. y = p ≤ .001.
x = p ≤ .01. z = p ≤ .0001.

How Has Safe Kids/Safe Streets Affected the Stakeholders and Their Agencies?

Above, we reported that half of all respondents represented organizations that had contributed staff to SK/SS, and over a third represented organizations that had received project funds (see Table 3-6). We also asked other questions about the effects of Safe Kids/Safe Streets on the respondents' agencies and on the respondents personally.

Personal Effects of Safe Kids/Safe Streets on Stakeholders

As in past surveys, most respondents reported that they had benefited personally from participating in SK/SS (see Table 3-10)—most often through making new contacts. Nearly three-fourths (72%) said they had made new contacts in the child abuse and neglect field, 55 percent had made new contacts in the juvenile justice field, and 35 percent had made new contacts in other fields. Over half the respondents reported that they had received some new training because of their involvement, and half agreed that participation in SK/SS had increased their ability to do their jobs effectively. On both these items, percentages were up considerably from the 2001 survey—increasing from 37 percent to 54 percent on the training item and from 43 to 52 percent on the item about the ability to do one's job. Responses to the contact items did not change much.

Responses differed significantly across sites in three of the five areas—making new contacts in the child abuse and neglect field, receiving new training, and increasing the ability to do one's job. Over 80 percent of Burlington and Toledo respondents reported making new contacts in the child abuse and neglect field, with Huntsville and Kansas City close behind. In contrast, not quite half of the Sault Ste. Marie respondents reported this benefit. The majority of stakeholders in all sites but Sault Ste. Marie also reported making new contacts in the juvenile justice field. However, Kansas City respondents (34%) were least likely to report receiving new training, while elsewhere the majority—ranging from 53 percent in Sault Ste. Marie to 63 percent in Huntsville—reported this benefit. Even in Kansas City, however, the percentage reporting new training because of SK/SS practically doubled since 2001 (from 18% to 34%), and increases were substantial at all sites. The proportion of respondents who reported receiving new training increased from 37 to 59 percent in Burlington, from 53 to 63 percent in Huntsville, from 35 to 53 percent in Sault Ste. Marie, and from 33 to 62 percent in Toledo.

Respondents from the different sites also differed significantly on the item related to ability to do one's job. Most stakeholders in Burlington, Huntsville, and Toledo said that they had increased their ability to do their job effectively, while only a minority said so in Sault Ste. Marie and Kansas City. Again, however, the Kansas City proportion had actually increased markedly, from 24 percent in 2001 to 45 percent in the 2003 survey. Burlington was the only other site to show a large increase on this item, from 50 to 66 percent.

Table 3-10. Personal Effects of SK/SS on Stakeholders

	Burlington (N=70)	Huntsville (N=62)	Kansas City (N=56)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=55)	Toledo (N=29)	**All Sites (N=272)**
As a result of participating in SK/SS, have you personally…[1]						
Made new contacts in the child abuse and neglect field	84%	73%	75%	49%	83%	**72%**[c]
Made new contacts in the juvenile justice field	61	53	59	40	66	**55**
Made new contacts in other fields	31	45	32	24	45	**35**
Received any new training	59	63	34	53	62	**54**[b]
Increased your ability to do your job effectively	66	56	45	36	52	**52**[b]
Number of personal benefits reported (from list above)[2]						
None	7%	2%	4%	2%	0%	**3%**
1 benefit	13	31	32	45	31	**29**
2 benefits	31	16	30	24	7	**24**
3 benefits	33	24	18	16	28	**24**
4 benefits	16	27	16	13	34	**20**
Mean number of personal benefits	2.4	2.5	2.1	1.9	2.7	**2.3**[w]

[1] Responses do not add to 100 percent because respondents could choose multiple answers.
[2] Represents a count of the types of personal benefits identified. The maximum value would be 5 if a respondent reported all 5 types of benefits, but no respondent reported more than 4 types.

Significance levels of χ^2:
a = $p \leq .05$.
b = $p \leq .01$.
c = $p \leq .001$.
d = $p \leq .0001$.

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$.
x = $p \leq .01$.
y = $p \leq .001$.
z = $p \leq .0001$.

We looked at benefits in one other way, counting the number of personal benefits reported by each respondent. We found that on average, respondents reported benefits in two areas. Only 3 percent of stakeholders did not report any personal benefits, while 20 percent checked four of the five benefits. Toledo respondents reported the most benefits (an average of 2.7 per respondent) and Sault Ste. Marie the fewest (1.9 benefits). Even in Sault Ste. Marie, however, respondents rarely said that they had received no benefits from participation in the project.

Who reported the most benefits from participating in SK/SS? Overall, the analysis showed a strong correlation between the number of benefits reported and the number of SK/SS meetings attended and the number of types of involvement reported (r=.36 and .35, p≤.0001).

With a couple of exceptions, these relationships were significant at the site level as well.[29] Correlations do not establish the causal direction of the relationships, however. We suspect that there are reciprocal effects—that is, those who are more involved derive more personal benefits, but those who perceive more personal benefits from participation also choose to be more involved.

For several other aspects of involvement, the correlations with personal benefits were small. For instance, the number of personal benefits reported was only weakly correlated with representing an organization that had received funds ($r=.13$, $p\leq.05$), and correlations were not significant at the site level. Personal benefits were unrelated to a respondent's length of involvement in SK/SS, his or her agency affiliation, and authority to make decisions.

Organizational Changes Resulting From Stakeholders' Safe Kids/Safe Streets Involvement

We asked stakeholders how much SK/SS had affected their own organizations overall, and how much it had affected specific procedures, resources, and caseloads. The specific items encompassed a range of possible effects, including changes that might be expected in the short term (such as improved communication with other agencies) and longer term outcomes (such as reduced caseloads or changes in budget priorities). The questions about overall effects were new, asking whether SK/SS had "significantly affected operations within your organization" and whether it had "significantly impacted the children and families served by your organization." Respondents rated all these effects, overall and specific items, on a 5-point scale, where 1 indicated that things had changed "not at all" and 5 indicated that things had changed "a great deal."

We see from Table 3-11 that across all sites, the majority of respondents (53%) reported that SK/SS had significantly affected their clients, choosing a rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale. A smaller proportion—about one-third—reported such impacts on their operations. The cross-site differences were not statistically significant on either item.

[29] In Burlington, benefits and number of types of involvement were not correlated; in Kansas City, there was no correlation between benefits and number of meetings attended.

Table 3-11. Overall Ratings of SK/SS Effects on Stakeholder's Own Organization and Clients

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Overall, would you say that SK/SS has significantly:[1] (N)						
Affected operations within your own organization? (N)	(58)	(53)	(47)	(52)	(22)	**(232)**
1 Not at all	17%	21%	21%	17%	5%	**18%**
2	29	23	17	23	18	**23**
3	29	23	28	27	23	**26**
4	19	28	17	21	45	**24**
5 A great deal	5	6	17	12	9	**9**
Mean rating	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.4	**2.8**
Impacted children and families served by your organization? (N)	(60)	(53)	(48)	(50)	(24)	**(235)**
1 Not at all	5%	6%	13%	6%	4%	**7%**
2	10	13	17	18	13	**14**
3	30	25	21	34	8	**26**
4	37	25	29	22	67	**32**
5 A great deal	18	32	21	20	8	**21**
Mean rating	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.6	**3.5**

[1] Respondents rated extent of change on a 5-point scale, where "1" means "Not at all" and "5" means "A great deal."

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.
x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

Admittedly, asking for significant *overall* effects on an agency's operations is a fairly demanding test, given the diversity of agencies represented and the fact that some SK/SS initiatives may have been narrowly targeted to a specific practice or set of agencies. Anyway, as we can see from Table 3-12, respondents more often reported *specific* organizational changes. There were two areas in which the majority of respondents overall reported "large" effects on their own organizations (as indicated by a rating of 4 or 5) and three other areas where at least 40 percent saw such effects. These included:

- Improved communication with other organizations (reported by 56% of respondents),
- Improved communication with community members (51%),
- Improved training and professional development (45%),
- Expansion of the scope of services/activities (43%), and
- Increases in the amount or quality of information available for decisionmaking (40%).

Table 3-12. Proportion of Stakeholders Reporting Large Effects on Own Organization as a Result of SK/SS Involvement[1,2]

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites[3]**
Thinking just of your own organization, has involvement in SK/SS… (N)	(45-60)	(33-53)	(30-50)	(27-51)	(11-24)	**(151-233)**
(% awarding ratings of 4 or 5)						
Improved communication with other organizations	68%	66%	44%	38%	60%	**56%**
Improved communication with community members	59	60	38	42	50	**51**
Improved training/professional development	46	64	29	34	55	**45**^{w}
Expanded the scope of services/activities	51	41	35	34	53	**43**
Increased the amount or quality of information available for making decisions	42	55	25	34	44	**40**
Changed how your agency communicates with other agencies or organizations	33	50	29	32	38	**36**
Made your agency more accessible to cultural/ethnic minorities	24	48	31	41	29	**36**^{w}
Improved communication with clients	33	50	24	34	25	**34**
Increased money/staff available for services	40	27	27	20	30	**30**
Changed your routine procedures	20	28	13	16	37	**21**^{w}
Increased caseloads	13	14	13	15	28	**15**
Altered staffing assignments	14	15	12	14	27	**15**
Changed your budget priorities	6	8	12	2	32	**10**^{w}
Lowered caseloads	2	0	0	0	9	**2**
Number of large organizational effects reported[4] (N)	(65)	(56)	(53)	(52)	(25)	**(251)**
None	20%	21%	36%	38%	20%	**27%**
1-2 effects	15	11	25	19	20	**18**
3-4 effects	22	21	17	13	16	**18**
5-7 effects	31	18	11	13	24	**20**
8 –10 effects	11	23	8	12	16	**14**
11 or more effects	2	5	4	4	4	**4**
Mean number of large effects	3.9	4.6	2.6	3.0	4.4	**3.7**^{w}

1 Respondents rated extent of change on a 5-point scale, where 1 means "Not at all" and 5 means "A great deal." The table displays the proportion reporting "large" effects, defined as ratings of 4 or 5. Complete frequencies by site and average ratings are shown in Appendix Table C-5.

2 Large percentages of respondents skipped these items or indicated that the item did not apply. Nonresponse rates ranged from 16 percent ("Improved communication with other organizations") to 45 percent ("Lowered caseloads").

3 Significance tests examined differences in average ratings across sites.

4 This represents a count of all effects rated 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale. The maximum value is 16 if a respondent reported large effects in all areas, but no respondents reported more than 12 large effects.

Indicates that 40 percent or more respondents rated this effect a 4 or a 5.

Significance levels of F:

w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.

x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

These items all fall under what might be termed short- or intermediate-term results of SK/SS. The effects reported least often were increases in caseloads (15%), altered staffing assignments (15%), changes in budget priorities (10%), and decreases in caseloads (2%). In terms of the overall logic of SK/SS, these might be considered intermediate to longer term outcomes of SK/SS.[30]

At the site level, the pattern of effects was similar at the extremes—lowered caseloads were least often reported everywhere, and improved communication with other organizations was the most frequently reported effect except in Sault Ste. Marie, where respondents most often reported improved communication with community members . Sault Ste. Marie was also unusual in that almost as many respondents reported improvements in accessibility to cultural/ethnic minorities. Although there is a good deal of variation in the ordering of other effects within sites, usually the average ratings of effects (on the 1-to-5 scale) across sites did not differ significantly.[31] The exceptions occurred for:

- Improved training/professional development—where average ratings by Huntsville respondents were the highest and ratings by Kansas City respondents the lowest;
- Making the respondent's agency more accessible to cultural/ethnic minorities—where Sault Ste. Marie and Huntsville respondents awarded higher average ratings than their counterparts elsewhere;
- Changing routine procedures—ratings for Toledo respondents were higher than elsewhere;
- Changing budget priorities—where again, Toledo respondents awarded the highest average ratings.

When we counted how *many* organizational effects were reported, we found that stakeholders reported an average of 3.7 "large" effects. (See bottom section of Table 3-12.) Twenty-seven percent of respondents reported no large effects at all, while 38 percent reported five or more. An examination of cross-site differences uncovered some statistically significant findings. Huntsville, Toledo, and Burlington respondents reported more effects (an average of 4.6, 4.4, and 3.9 respectively) than those in Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie (3.6 and 3.0). As Table 3-12 shows, only one effect in Sault Ste. Marie was reported by as many as 40 percent of

[30] We recognize that some effects might be interpreted differently at the agency level. For instance, an award of SK/SS funds for a new service could increase caseloads and alter staffing assignments almost immediately.

[31] Average ratings and complete frequencies for all items, by site, can be found in Appendix Table C-5.

respondents, and no effects were reported that frequently in Kansas City. Comparing these findings with those from 2001, we noted that overall, respondents reported slightly more large effects than they did previously (3.7 for this survey vs. 3.4 before). Also, results for most of the specific effects were fairly similar to the 2001 survey, except on three items. Reports of large effects on the respondent's organization increased noticeably for improved communication with other organizations (56% reported large effects vs. 40% previously), improved communication with community members (51% vs. 43%), and making the agency more accessible to cultural/ethnic minorities (36% vs. 28%). Closer inspection revealed more variety at the site level, however.

- In Kansas City, the average number of reported effects went from 3.6 in 2001 to 2.6 currently—the only site with a decrease. The proportion of respondents reporting many of the specific effects went down, although usually by small amounts.
- In Toledo and Sault Ste. Marie, we saw the opposite pattern—with more large effects reported, on average, than in 2001, and increases on nearly every individual item. The average number of large effects increased from 2.7 to 4.4 in Toledo and from 2.1 to 3.0 in Sault Ste. Marie.
- In Burlington and Huntsville, the average number of reported effects increased only slightly (by .3 and .2 respectively), reflecting the fact that some individual effects were reported more frequently than in 2001 and others less frequently.

Table 3-13 below summarizes changes in reported effects of 15 percentage points or more in either direction. Keep in mind that 15 percent translates into about seven to nine respondents in Burlington, five to eight respondents in Huntsville, Kansas City, and Sault Ste. Marie, and two to four respondents in Toledo—depending on the number who answered a particular item.

For the most part, the number of large effects reported by a respondent did not correlate with the respondent's agency type, authority to make decisions, or length of involvement in SK/SS.[32]

[32] In Burlington, those who became involved in SK/SS more recently were somewhat less likely to report changes ($r=-.24$, $p\leq.05$). In Kansas City, respondents from public agencies were less likely to report changes ($r=-.27$, $p\leq.05$).

Table 3-13. Changes in Stakeholder Ratings of Organizational Effects: 2003 Stakeholder Survey[1]

Site	Increases of 15% or More	Decreases of 15% or More
Burlington	▪ Improved communication with community members [+19]	—
Huntsville	—	—
Kansas City	—	▪ Changed your routine procedures [-17] ▪ Altered staffing assignments [-17]
Sault Ste. Marie	▪ Improved communication with community members [+16]	—
Toledo	▪ Changed your budget priorities [+32] ▪ Altered staffing assignments [+27] ▪ Changed your routine procedures [+25] ▪ Improved training/professional development [+23] ▪ Improved communication with other organizations [+21] ▪ Changed how your agency communicates with other agencies or organizations [+18] ▪ Increased money/staff available for services [+17] ▪ Increased caseloads [+15]	—

[1] Table includes all items for which reports of large effects increased or decreased by 15 percentage points over reported effects in the 2001 Stakeholder Survey. Absolute changes are shown in brackets. For example, a decrease from 55% to 40% of respondents reporting altered staffing assignments would be included in the table, with -15 in brackets.

How Do Stakeholders Rate the Effects of Safe Kids/Safe Streets on Their Communities?

Besides asking about effects on the stakeholders themselves and their own organizations, we also asked how SK/SS had affected the community. The survey items covered 19 different effects, mostly drawn from the objectives of the original program solicitation for SK/SS. Table 3-14 shows these effects, grouped by SK/SS program strategy. (Admittedly, some effects might reasonably belong to more than one category, but we picked the one that we thought was the closest fit. For example, we placed "expanding prevention programs" under Ensuring a Full Continuum of Services, but one could make the case for including it under Prevention Education and Public Awareness.) The table indicates the proportion of respondents who reported "strong" effects, which we defined as a rating of 4 or 5 on a scale ranging from 1, "no

Table 3-14. Proportion and Number of Stakeholders Reporting Strong SK/SS Effects[1]

	Burlington (N=39-67)	Huntsville (N=33-59)	Kansas City (N=37-52)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=39-49)	Toledo (N=22-29)	**All Sites[3] (N=178-254)**
The Federal SK/SS program has many goals and objectives related to child abuse and neglect. Not all sites are placing the same emphasis on each one. So far in your community, do you believe SK/SS has had any effect on:[2]						
System Reform and Accountability						
Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect	83%	83%	68%	61%	75%	**74%[x]**
Improving multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence	68	79	58	61	64	**67[x]**
Making professionals/services more sensitive to the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the children and families they serve	46	85	45	62	51	**59[z]**
Improving case management and follow-up for families	56	70	40	51	67	**56[x]**
Leveraging resources across public/private agencies to support children/families	47	68	54	35	38	**50[x]**
Involving grassroots organizations, religious organizations, and informal networks such as extended families in supporting children/families	34	64	52	32	25	**43[z]**
Holding offenders more accountable	40	57	29	21	40	**37[z]**
Ensuring a Full Continuum of Services						
Expanding prevention programs	63	65	60	50	62	**60**
Improving needs assessment for children/ families	57	75	48	51	64	**59[x]**
Improving services for children/families who might "fall through the cracks"	57	70	50	49	50	**56**
Expanding treatment services for victimized children	55	78	38	39	72	**55[z]**
Expanding early intervention programs	56	58	55	38	60	**53[w]**
Expanding treatment services for juvenile sex offenders	37	46	30	23	37	**34[w]**
Reaching underserved rural areas	31	45	19	51	14	**34[z]**
Data Collection and Local Evaluation						
Improving information-sharing and case tracking across agencies	66	69	53	40	75	**60[y]**
Evaluating local practices and outcomes	53	70	52	26	50	**51[x]**
Standardizing data collection across agencies	25	50	33	18	61	**35[y]**

Table 3-14. Proportion and Number of Stakeholders Reporting Strong SK/SS Effects[1] (continued)

	Burlington (N=39-67)	Huntsville (N=33-59)	Kansas City (N=37-52)	Sault Ste. Marie (N=39-49)	Toledo (N=22-29)	**All Sites[3] (N=178-254)**
Prevention Education and Public Awareness						
Educating community residents, including parents, about child abuse and neglect	60	74	57	51	64	**61**
Decreasing community tolerance for child abuse and neglect	52	73	49	44	48	**54[x]**
Number of strong effects identifed[4]	(N=67)	(N=59)	(N=52)	(N=50)	(N=30)	**(N=258)**
None	6%	3%	17%	20%	10%	**11%**
1-3 effects	9	10	15	16	10	**12**
4-6 effects	18	8	10	8	10	**11**
7-9 effects	28	19	21	20	27	**23**
10-15 effects	34	39	21	22	30	**30**
16-19 effects	4	20	15	14	13	**13**
Mean number of strong effects	8.3	10.7	8.0	7.2	8.7	**8.6[x]**

[1] Respondents ranked effects on a 5-point scale, where "1" stands for "No effect at all" and "5" stands for "A major effect." Many respondents skipped these items or indicated that they had "no opinion." Nonresponse rates exceeded 20 percent on most items. They ranged from a low of 8 percent ("Improving communication and cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect") to 36 percent ("Reaching underserved rural areas").

[2] This portion of the table displays the proportion reporting "significant" effects, defined as ratings of 4 or 5. Complete frequencies and average ratings by site are shown in Appendix Table C-6.

[3] Significance tests examined average ratings across sites.

[4] This represents the number of previous items rated "4" or "5" on the 5-point scale of effects. The maximum value is 19 for respondents who report strong effects on all 19 items.

Indicates 50 percent or more rated this effect a 4 or a 5.

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.
x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

effect at all," to 5, "a major effect." Effects rated as strong by 50 percent or more of the respondents are highlighted.

First, we note that the stakeholders more often reported community effects than effects on their own organizations. Most of the community effects in Table 3-14 were reported by a majority of the respondents, in comparison to just two of the organizational effects listed in Table 3-12. However, in both the community and organizational domains, the most frequently reported effects involve improvements in communication. In the community domain, 74 percent of all respondents reported that SK/SS had improved communication and cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect. This and the second most commonly reported

effect—improving multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence (67% of all respondents)—both fall into the system reform category. But respondents frequently reported strong effects in all four SK/SS strategy areas. Other effects reported by a majority of respondents included:

- Under system reform: making services more ethnically and culturally sensitive (59%), improving case management and followup (56%), and leveraging resources across public/private agencies to support children and families (50%).
- Under ensuring the continuum of services: expanding prevention programs (60%), improving needs assessment (59%), improving services for children and families who might "fall through the cracks" (56%), expanding treatment services for victimized children (55%), and expanding early intervention programs (53%).
- Under data collection and evaluation: improving information-sharing and case tracking across agencies (60%) and evaluating local practices and outcomes (51%).
- Under prevention education and public awareness: educating community residents, including parents, about child abuse and neglect (61%) and decreasing community tolerance for child abuse and neglect (54%).

The least frequently reported community-level effects were expanding treatment for juvenile sex offenders (34%) and reaching underserved rural areas (34%), both from the service continuum category, and standardizing data collection across agencies (35%), from the data collection and evaluation category.

Table 3-14 also shows the total number of strong community effects reported by our respondents. On average, respondents reported 8.6 strong effects, up from an average of 7.9 in 2001. Forty-three percent reported 10 or more effects, and only 1 in 10 reported none.

Cross-site analyses revealed considerable variation in reporting specific community effects. Statistically significant differences in the average ratings of effects were observed for most items in Table 3-14, and for the total number of effects reported. Following the broad pattern we saw in 2001, Huntsville respondents were the most likely to report any given effect, with Sault Ste. Marie stakeholders typically the least likely to do so. Sault Ste. Marie respondents continued to be the most likely to report effects on reaching underserved

rural areas, however. And Toledo respondents continued to be most likely to report effects on expanding early intervention programs and standardizing data collection across agencies.

While these broad patterns remained fairly stable, there were some noteworthy shifts. First, while Huntsville and Toledo continued to report the most effects, Sault Ste. Marie, Kansas City, and Burlington respondents moved closer to them in terms of overall averages. The average number of effects reported for Sault Ste. Marie jumped from 5.6 in 2001 to 7.2 in 2003. In Burlington, the average went from 7.0 to 8.3 and in Kansas City, from 7.0 to 8.0. Meanwhile, the average stayed the same in Huntsville and dropped by .4 in Toledo.

Also, the comparisons found some fairly large shifts in the proportion of respondents reporting some of the specific effects. Table 3-15 displays all items where there were percentage changes of 15 percent or more. In some cases, these changes occurred in areas where limited effects were reported in 2001. For instance, both Burlington and Toledo respondents posted large increases on making professionals/services more sensitive to the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of their clients in 2003. More Burlington respondents also reported effects on reaching underserved rural areas, the least common community effect in 2001. In Sault Ste. Marie, the proportion of respondents reporting improvements in multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence more than doubled, and the percent reporting improved case management and follow-up for troubled families nearly did. Toledo was unusual, however, in that 2003 respondents were considerably less likely to report effects in several areas that had rated high with previous respondents.

In the overall pool of respondents and at the site level, further analyses revealed a strong correlation between reporting SK/SS effects on the community and reporting effects on the respondent's own organization. This was true whether the measure used was the number of large organizational effects reported ($r=.61$, $p\leq.0001$ for the total pool) or the rating of SK/SS's effect on organizational operations overall ($r=.52$, $p\leq.0001$). As with organizational effects, the analyses found no relationship between the respondent's agency type, level of authority, and length of involvement in SK/SS and perceptions of community effects overall.[33]

[33] At the site level, there was one exception to the overall pattern. In Sault Ste. Marie, respondents with higher levels of authority tended to report more community effects ($r=.51$, $p\leq.01$).

Table 3-15. Changes in Stakeholder Ratings of Community Effects: 2003 Stakeholder Survey[1]

Site	Increases of 15% or More	Decreases of 15% or More
Burlington	▪ Reaching underserved rural areas [+25] ▪ Improving information-sharing and case tracking across agencies [+23] ▪ Making professionals/services more sensitive to the ethnic/cultural backgrounds of the children and families they serve [+21] ▪ Involving grassroots organizations, religious organizations, and informal networks such as extended families in supporting children and families [+16]	—
Huntsville	—	—
Kansas City	—	—
Sault Ste. Marie	▪ Improving multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence [+31] ▪ Improving case management and follow-up for troubled families [+24]	—
Toledo	▪ Making professionals/services more sensitive to the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the children and families they serve [+20]	▪ Improving needs assessment for children/families [-25%] ▪ Improving services for children/ families who might "fall through the cracks" [-22] ▪ Leveraging resources across public/ private agencies to support troubled children/families [-18%] ▪ Holding offenders more accountable [16] ▪ Expanding treatment services for juvenile sex offenders [-16] ▪ Expanding early intervention programs [-15]

[1] Table includes all items for which reports of significant effects increased or decreased by 15 percentage points over reported effects in the 2001 Stakeholder Survey. Absolute changes are shown in brackets. For example, a decrease from 55 percent to 40 percent of respondents reporting effects on reaching underserved rural areas would be included in the table, with -15 in brackets.

What Community Effects Were the Most Important?

Because respondents reported so many community effects, even in 2001, in the 2003 survey we asked them to choose the top two accomplishments from the list shown in Table 3-14. Table 3-16 shows the results .

Looking at the aggregate responses across sites, we find that for the most part, the community effects that were reported most frequently are also the effects that are rated as the most important accomplishments overall. Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect again takes first place, with 48 percent of all respondents choosing it as one of the two most important effects. The other four—expanding prevention programs, making professionals/services more ethnically and culturally sensitive, improving multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence, and improved information-sharing and case-tracking—were also very frequently reported overall. Only educating community residents and parents about child abuse and neglect—the third most frequently reported effect—does not appear on the "most important" list. Thus, at least one effect from each of the strategy areas except prevention education/public awareness is represented. It is also noteworthy that effects on multiagency responses to domestic violence rank so high. This theme was not even mentioned in the original program solicitation for SK/SS, but the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) funded and monitored two of the SK/SS sites and encouraged them to connect with other OVW programs in their area. Also, domestic violence became a regular topic of discussion at SK/SS cluster conferences by 1999.

At the site level, improved communication/cooperation is the only effect to show up on every site's list. There were other interesting patterns:

- Sault Ste. Marie was the only site where either of the prevention education and public awareness effects—in this case, educating community residents and parents about child abuse and neglect—was chosen by a large proportion of respondents (41%). Elsewhere, these effects took fourth or fifth place, if they made the top five at all.

Table 3-16. Stakeholder Opinions of Most Important SK/SS Accomplishments: Top Five Choices[1]

Site	SK/SS Strategy[2]	Accomplishment[3]
Burlington (N=65)	SyR	1. Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect [63%]
	S	2. Improving services for children/families who might "fall through the cracks" [23%]
	SyR	3. Improving case management and follow-up for families [18%]
	D	4. Improving information sharing and case tracking across agencies [18%]
	S	5. Expanding prevention programs [15%]
Huntsville (N=53)	SyR	1. Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect [42%]
	SyR	2. Making professionals/services more sensitive to the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the children and families they serve [25%]
	SyR	3. Improving multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence [19%]
	P	4. Educating community residents, including parents, about child abuse and neglect [15%]
	P	5. Decreasing community tolerance for child abuse and neglect [13%]
Kansas City (N=45)	SyR	1. Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect [53%]
	SyR	2. Involving grassroots organizations, religious organizations, and informal networks such as extended families in supporting children/families [27%]
	S	3. Expanding prevention programs [22%]
	SyR	4. Improving case management and follow-up for families [11%]
	S	5. Expanding treatment services for victimized children [11%]
Sault Ste. Marie (N=41)	P	1. Educating community residents, including parents, about child abuse and neglect [41%]
	SyR	2. Making professionals/services more sensitive to the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the children and families they serve [32%]
	SyR	3. Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect [29%]
	SyR	4. Improving multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence [17%]
	S	5. Expanding prevention programs [12%]
Toledo (N=23)	D	1. Improving information sharing and case tracking across agencies [48%]
	SyR	2. Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect [39%]
	D	3. Standardizing data collection across agencies [30%]
	S	4. Expanding prevention programs [22%]
	P	5. Decreasing community tolerance for child abuse and neglect [17%]
All Sites (N=227)	SyR	1. Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect [48%]
	S	2. Expanding prevention programs [16%]
	SyR	3. Making professionals/services more sensitive to the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the children and families they serve [14%]
	SyR	4. Improving multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence [14%]
	D	5. Improving information sharing and case tracking across agencies [14%]

[1] Stakeholders were asked to choose from among the effects listed in Table 3-14, "what do you consider the two most important accomplishments of SK/SS to date?" The table shows the five most frequently selected accomplishments for each site and overall. Percentages selecting each accomplishment are shown in brackets. Total percentages can exceed 100 because stakeholders could select two responses.

[2] Refers to the four SK/SS elements or strategies: SyR=System reform and accountability; S=Ensuring a full continuum of services; D=Data collection and local evaluation; P=Prevention education and public awareness.

[3] The rankings in this table recognize ties (the same percentage) by assigning tied items to the same rank.

- Burlington and Kansas City respondents were similar in many respects. Neither group placed effects from the prevention education category in the top five, but they had three other effects in common—improving communication/ cooperation (number one in both), improving case management and follow-up, and expanding prevention programs. Each was unique, however, in having a second-place effect that showed up on no other site's list. In Kansas City, it was involving grassroots organizations, religious organizations, and informal networks, chosen by 27 percent of respondents. For Burlington, it was improving services for children/families who might fall through the cracks, chosen by 23 percent.

- Huntsville and Sault Ste. Marie respondents also were similar, in that they had four top effects in common, including the universal choice of effects on improving communication/cooperation. However, both their lists included effects on ethnic/cultural sensitivity (ranking second in both sites, and chosen by 25 percent and 32 percent of respondents, respectively), responses to children affected by domestic violence, and educating community residents—none of which made the top five elsewhere.

- Toledo respondents were unique in naming two important effects in the data sphere. Improving information-sharing and case tracking took first place, chosen by 48 percent of respondents, and standardizing data collection across agencies took third (30%).

How Satisfied Are Stakeholders With the Overall Accomplishments of Safe Kids/Safe Streets So Far?

Beyond asking about the personal, organizational, and community effects of SK/SS, we asked stakeholders to tell us how satisfied they were with the program's overall accomplishments. Overall satisfaction appeared high. (See Table 3-17.) Sixty-six percent of all respondents awarded ratings of 4 or 5 on a scale where 1 represented "not at all satisfied" and 5 represented "extremely satisfied." Only 11 percent fell into the "dissatisfied" range of 1 or 2.

The average rating across all sites was 3.8. Huntsville respondents seemed the most satisfied, awarding an average rating of 4.1, and Sault Ste. Marie the least satisfied, with an average rating of 3.5. In Sault Ste. Marie, the proportion of dissatisfied respondents equaled the respondents who were "extremely satisfied" (rating of 5). Elsewhere, the extremely satisfied outnumbered the dissatisfied—and by a wide margin in Burlington, Huntsville, and Toledo. These cross-site differences were statistically significant. Nonetheless, the gap between sites on overall satisfaction has narrowed. While average ratings in Huntsville, Burlington, and Toledo remained about the same in 2003 as in 2001, they increased by .4 in Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie.

Table 3-17. Stakeholder Assessments of the Overall Accomplishments of SK/SS

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Overall, how satisfied are you with what Safe Kids/Safe Streets has accomplished so far? (N)	(68)	(61)	(55)	(51)	(29)	**(264)**
1 Not at all satisfied	1%	0%	4%	2%	0%	**2%**
2	6	7	11	16	3	**9**
3	22	15	20	33	38	**24**
4	38	41	38	31	38	**38**
5 Extremely satisfied	32	38	27	18	21	**28**
Mean rating of overall satisfaction	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.5	3.8	**3.8**[w]

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.
x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

In the next section, we explore further the factors related to satisfaction with SK/SS decisions and accomplishments.

How Is Stakeholder Satisfaction With Safe Kids/Safe Streets Related to Other Factors?

Having examined the characteristics of stakeholders, their involvement in and opinions about SK/SS implementation, and their perceptions of its results, we next explored how these factors related to their satisfaction with overall accomplishments. In 2001, we found that respondents who were more satisfied with the accomplishments of SK/SS were especially likely to:

- Be satisfied with project leadership, project communication, the decisionmaking process, and the decisions made about programs and priorities;
- View SK/SS as open and amenable to stakeholder influence;
- Report SK/SS effects on their own organization and the community;
- Expect that SK/SS would affect their organization's operations and their clients in the next 2 years; and
- Report personal benefits from participation in SK/SS.

Satisfaction with accomplishments was also correlated, but not as strongly, with greater personal involvement in SK/SS, higher ratings of importance for most SK/SS strategies,

and representing an agency that had received funds from SK/SS. We also found small to moderate correlations between satisfaction and most of the ratings of adequacy of investments, with the highest correlation observed for the rating of the amount of community involvement. However, the job characteristics of respondents (agency type and level of authority to make decisions) were not related to satisfaction.[34]

With the 2003 data, we re-examined the relationship between satisfaction and other stakeholder characteristics and opinions. Most of the variables we looked at were identical to those used in 2001. However, we added variables based on several new questions in the 2003 survey. These included the ratings of the importance of the eight system reform dimensions and the rating of how significantly SK/SS had affected the respondent's own organization and clients overall.[35] Table 3-18 presents the Spearman correlation statistics, based on the entire pool of respondents.[36] Statistically significant correlations are shown in bold, and correlations of .30 or above are also highlighted. Site-specific results appear in Appendix Table C-7.

The results for 2003 were similar to those for 2001 in most respects. As seen in Table 3-18, satisfaction with accomplishments was most strongly correlated with:

- Ratings of stakeholder influence ($r=.33$ to $.51$, $p\leq.0001$) and especially the perception that SK/SS was open to different points of view ($r=.65$, $p\leq.0001$);
- Satisfaction with other aspects of the implementation process, including leadership, communication, and the process for making decisions ($r=.59$ to $.66$, $p\leq.0001$);
- Satisfaction with the decisions made about priorities and programs ($r=.54$ and $.64$, $p\leq.0001$); and
- The perception that SK/SS had affected the respondent's own organization, its clients, and the community ($r=.52$ to $.65$, $p\leq.0001$).

---

[34] Note that relationships to agency type might not be detectable with our three agency measures, which characterize each respondent's affiliation in three ways—public vs. other, private vs. other, and formal child protection system vs. other. Unfortunately, we cannot use finer agency breakdowns in our analyses because there would be too few respondents in each category.

[35] We also dropped two variables concerning the expected effects of SK/SS, because these questions did not appear on the 2003 survey.

[36] We also examined site-specific correlations for all variables and mention a few of the results in the text. Consult Appendix Table C-7 for a chart of the overall and site-specific relationships. In some cases, the site-specific relationships differed from the overall pattern. That is, a statistically significant relationship in the overall pool was not significant at the site level, or occasionally, a relationship was significant at one or more individual sites, but not overall.

Table 3-18. Correlations Between Stakeholder Satisfaction With SK/SS Accomplishments So Far and Other Stakeholder Characteristics and Opinions: All Sites

Stakeholder Characteristics/Opinions	Spearman's Correlation Coefficient[1]
Job Characteristics (N)	(224-264)
Agency type	
- Formal child protection system vs. other agencies[2]	-.06
- Public agency vs. all others	-.04
- Private provider/agency vs. all others	<.01
Level of authority to make decisions in own agency	.06
Organizational Involvement in SK/SS (N)	(240-254)
Organization received funds from SK/SS	.08
Organization contributed staff to SK/SS activities	.07
Adequacy of time respondent's organization contributed	-.04
Ratings of Importance of Federal SK/SS Strategies for Own Community (N)	(255-259)
Ensuring a full range of services, from prevention to treatment	**.19[b]**
Enhancing public awareness	**.23[c]**
Improving information systems and evaluation	**.29[d]**
System reform	**.20[c]**
Ratings of Importance of System Reform Dimensions	
Increasing communication and partnerships among agencies	**.29[d]**
Increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement	**.29[d]**
Improving cross-disciplinary training and skills	**.28[d]**
Increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions	**.27[d]**
Making the court process work more effectively	**.23[c]**
Increasing the cultural competence of agencies and staff	**.23[c]**
Increasing family involvement in decisionmaking	**.22[c]**
Reforming policies and procedures	**.21[c]**
Personal Involvement in SK/SS (N)	(247-263)
Served on Council or governing body	.07
Implemented activities/efforts funded by SK/SS	.09
No. of types of involvement	**.25[d]**
Hours per month in SK/SS meetings or other activities	**.27[d]**
No. of meetings attended in past year	**.34[d]**
Adequacy of time the respondent contributed	.10
Ratings of Stakeholder Influence (N)	(244-254)
Openness to different points of view	**.65[d]**
Influence over	
- Overall goals and objectives	**.51[d]**
- Funding decisions	**.33[d]**
- Program operations	**.44[d]**
Satisfaction with Implementation Process (N)	(181-242)
Leadership provided by grantee and staff	**.66[d]**
Communication between staff and other participants	**.59[d]**
Communication among SK/SS participants	**.60[d]**
Process for deciding on SK/SS programs and priorities	**.62[d]**
Satisfaction with Decisions (N)	(182-196)
Decisions made on SK/SS priorities	**.64[d]**
Decisions about which community programs to fund	**.54[d]**

Table 3-18. Correlations Between Stakeholder Satisfaction With SK/SS Accomplishments and Other Stakeholder Characteristics and Opinions : All Sites (continued)

Stakeholder Characteristics/Opinions	Spearman Correlation Coefficient[1]
Ratings of Adequacy of Investments Involved (N)	(204-244)
Adequacy of resources available to SK/SS	-.09
Adequacy of data available to guide decisions	**.23[c]**
Adequacy of effort spent on strategic planning	.14
Adequacy of guidance and TA from Federal sponsors	.10
Adequacy of involvement by professionals and agencies	**.21[c]**
Adequacy of community involvement	**.30[d]**
Adequacy of cultural/ethnic diversity of participants	**.20[b]**
Effects of SK/SS So Far (N)	(225-259)
No. of personal benefits reported	**.30[d]**
No. of large effects on own organization	**.60[d]**
Significantly affected operations within own organization, overall	**.52[d]**
Significantly affected children and families served by own organization, overall	**.65[d]**
No. of strong effects on community	**.61[d]**

[1] Statistically significant correlations are shown in bold, with correlations of .30 or greater also highlighted. The statistic reported is the Spearman correlation coefficient, which can range from .00, indicating no statistical relationship to plus or minus 1.0, indicating a perfect correlation. With a perfect correlation, it is possible to perfectly predict the response on one variable from a knowledge of the response on the other.

[2] The formal child protection system includes respondents who identified themselves as representing CPS, law enforcement, prosecution, or court agencies.

Indicates correlations of .30 or higher.

Significance levels:

a = p ≤ .05. c = p ≤ .001.

b = p ≤ .01. d = p ≤ .0001.

In addition, those who were more satisfied with SK/SS accomplishments:

- Had attended more project-related meetings in the past year (r=.34, p≤.0001);
- Reported more personal benefits from participation (r=.30, p≤.0001); and
- Were more satisfied with the level of community involvement (r=.30, p≤.0001).

For all these items, we found similar patterns when we examined the relationships at the site levels. That is, relationships that emerged in the overall pool were usually significant within sites as well.

We also observed weaker but statistically significant relationships overall on several other items, including the ratings of the SK/SS strategies, the ratings of the system reform dimensions, the time spent on SK/SS monthly, and the number of types of involvement reported by the respondent. As in 2001, service on the SK/SS governing body was not related to satisfaction with accomplishments. This time, however, the respondent's involvement in implementing efforts funded by SK/SS and whether the respondent's organization had received SK/SS funding were not related either. Some ratings of investment adequacy (besides community involvement) were modestly correlated with satisfaction, although not as many as in 2001. As in 2001, satisfaction with accomplishments was not associated with the respondent's agency type or level of authority to make decisions for his or her organization.

Do Stakeholders Expect To Remain Involved in Safe Kids/Safe Streets?

A significant concern for any collaborative is whether it can retain the involvement and commitment of its members over time. While some turnover is inevitable and probably desirable, a large exodus of stakeholders would be a significant cause for concern. Previous stakeholder surveys and our observations during site visits suggested that this had not been a serious issue for SK/SS in earlier stages of implementation. However, new concerns about commitment arise as sites approach the end of Federal support for SK/SS. Foremost among them, can the collaborative retain its members until the SK/SS mission is complete, or will they begin to drift away, finding other activities a higher priority? A related question is whether the collaborative will survive in some recognizable form once Federal funding ends. This was never an OJP requirement, but it seems likely that stakeholders who see a long-term future for the collaborative will more likely stick around as it completes its federally funded work.[37] We explored these issues in the 2003 Stakeholder Survey, using three different measures.

As shown in Table 3-19, we first asked stakeholders about the likelihood that the SK/SS collaborative would continue in some form after Federal funding ended. Fifty-six percent of all respondents indicated that they thought continuation was likely, by choosing ratings of 4 or 5 on a scale ranging from 1, "not at all likely," to 5, "extremely likely." About the same proportion (55%) said that they expected to be involved in SK/SS during the coming

[37] OJP saw the collaborative as the vehicle for putting sustainable structures, policies, and practices in place during SK/SS. The vehicle itself need not continue if these changes could be sustained by other means. By the time of the 2003 survey, however, most sites were hoping to continue their collaborative structure in some form if they could find the resources to do so.

Table 3-19. Stakeholder Expectations for Future Involvement

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
After Federal funding ends, how likely is the SK/SS collaborative to continue in some form? (N)	(55)	(58)	(46)	(43)	(25)	**(227)**
1 Not at all likely	7%	5%	4%	16%	4%	**7%**
2	9	14	24	16	12	**15**
3	24	21	28	14	24	**22**
4	35	33	26	35	20	**31**
5 Extremely likely	25	28	17	19	40	**25**
Mean rating	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.2	3.8	**3.5**
Looking ahead to the coming year, how likely are you to be personally involved in Safe Kids/Safe Streets?[1] (N)	(65)	(61)	(56)	(51)	(28)	**(261)**
1 Not at all likely	12%	7%	5%	12%	7%	**9%**
2	14	23	16	16	7	**16**
3	14	23	27	22	11	**20**
4	20	25	18	24	25	**22**
5 Extremely likely	40	23	34	27	50	**33**
Mean rating	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.4	4.0	**3.5**
Compared to the past year, do you expect your level of involvement to be: (N)	(66)	(59)	(55)	(51)	(29)	**(260)**
Less	23%	27%	4%	10%	14%	**16%[b]**
About the same	65	63	73	59	76	**66**
More	12	10	24	31	10	**18**

[1] Because Burlington and Toledo were projected to be out of Federal funds within the upcoming year, this question was worded slightly differently for their stakeholders: "Assuming the Safe Kids/Safe Streets collaborative continues for the coming year, how likely…."

Significance levels of χ^2:
a = $p \leq .05$.
b = $p \leq .01$.
c = $p \leq .001$.
d = $p \leq .0001$.

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$.
x = $p \leq .01$.
y = $p \leq .001$.
z = $p \leq .0001$.

year. (Because Federal funding for Toledo and Burlington was not expected to last another year, we modified this question for their stakeholders, so that it began with "Assuming the SK/SS collaborative continues for another year….") Finally, we asked whether respondents expected their level of involvement to change in the coming year. Overall, 66 percent expected it to stay about the same, with the remainder split about equally between those who thought their involvement would decline and those who thought it would increase. As we thought, expectations about the future of the collaborative and likelihood of personal involvement in the next year were strongly correlated overall ($r=.51$, $p\leq.0001$) and at the individual sites ($r=.42$ to

.61, p≤.01 to .0001). That is, people who expect the collaborative to survive were more likely to say they will be involved in the future.

Cross-site differences in expectations for the future of the collaborative and whether the respondent would be personally involved were not large enough to be statistically significant. However, respondents differed significantly across sites in their expectations for *level* of involvement. Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie respondents were far more likely to forecast increased involvement than their counterparts elsewhere. Note that at the time of the survey, these were the two sites where Federal funding was still expected for at least another year.

When we compared 2003 responses to those in 2001, a couple of shifts stood out.[38] First, in 2003 stakeholders in three sites more often said that they would be involved in the coming year. Toledo showed the biggest change, with 75 percent of stakeholders rating their likelihood of involvement a 4 or 5 in 2003. This compares to 50 percent of stakeholders in 2001. Burlington and Sault Ste. Marie also posted increases, from 49 percent to 60 percent and from 36 percent to 51 percent, respectively. In contrast, only 48 percent of Huntsville respondents indicated that they were likely to be involved in the coming year, compared to 63 percent in 2001. Kansas City was the only site where expectations for involvement were about the same as before. With respect to expected *level* of involvement, the only sizable change occurred in Huntsville, where 27 percent of 2003 respondents expected to be less involved in the coming year, compared to just 3 percent in 2001.

In the next section, we explore the factors related to a respondent's expectations for future involvement.

Which Respondents Expected To Remain Involved Next Year?

To probe how expectations for involvement were related to respondent characteristics and opinions about SK/SS, we examined several types of variables, repeating a similar analysis from 2001. As shown in Table 3-20, we looked at relationships to both the likelihood of continued involvement and the extent of expected involvement.

[38] Only two of the items shown in Table 3-18 were asked in 2001. The question about the likelihood of the collaboration continuing was new in 2003.

Table 3-20. Correlations Between Stakeholder Characteristics and Opinions and Their Expectations for Future Involvement in SK/SS: All Sites

	Likelihood of Involvement Next Year[1]	Extent of Expected Involvement[1]
Job Characteristics (N)	(219-261)	(218-260)
Agency type		
- Formal child protection system vs. other agencies[2]	-.02	.01
- Public agency vs. all others	.09	.12
- Private provider/agency vs. all others	-.03	-.09
Level of authority to make decisions in own agency	.06	.02
Organizational Involvement in SK/SS (N)	(235-250)	(235-249)
Organization received funds from SK/SS	.08	-.09
Organization contributed staff to SK/SS activities	**.17[b]**	-.01
Adequacy of time respondent's organization contributed	-.06	**-.20[b]**
Ratings of Importance of Federal SK/SS Strategies for Own Community (N)	(249-253)	(248-252)
Ensuring a full range of services, from prevention to treatment	**.21[c]**	**.12**
Enhancing public awareness	**.27[d]**	**.10**
Improving information systems and evaluation	**.29[d]**	**.16[b]**
System reform	**.22[c]**	**.13[a]**
Ratings of Importance of System Reform Dimensions		
- Increasing communication and partnerships among agencies	**.31[d]**	**.11**
- Increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement	**.22[c]**	**.10**
- Improving cross-disciplinary training and skills	**.28[d]**	**.11**
- Increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions	**.32[d]**	**.20[c]**
- Making the court process work more effectively	**.22[d]**	**.21[c]**
- Increasing the cultural competencies of agencies and staff	**.21[c]**	**.16[b]**
- Increasing family involvement in decisionmaking	**.19[b]**	**.17[b]**
- Reforming policies and procedures	**.23[c]**	.04
Personal Involvement in SK/SS (N)	(226-260)	(242-259)
Types of involvement		
- Served on Council or governing body	**.15[a]**	-.02
- Served on another project committee, team, or task force	**.37[d]**	.03
- Attended community meetings convened by SK/SS	**.36[d]**	.05
- Helped develop training or made presentations	**.28[d]**	.02
- Implemented activities/efforts funded by SK/SS	**.17[b]**	-.03
No. of types of involvement	**.51[d]**	.04
Hours per month in SK/SS meetings or other activities	**.45[d]**	.04
No. of meetings attended in past year	**.54[d]**	<.01
Difficulty of making time to participate	**-.31[d]**	-.11
Adequacy of time the respondent contributed	.12	**-.22[c]**
Ratings of Stakeholder Influence (N)	(236-246)	(238-247)
Openness to different points of view	**.47[d]**	**.18[b]**
Influence over		
- Overall goals and objectives	**.41[d]**	**.13[a]**
- Funding decisions	**.29[d]**	**.15[a]**
- Program operations	**.31[d]**	**.13[a]**

Table 3-20. Correlations Between Stakeholder Characteristics and Opinions and Their Expectations for Future Involvement in SK/SS: All Sites (continued)

	Likelihood of Involvement Next Year[1]	Extent of Expected Involvement[1]
Satisfaction with Implementation Process (N)	(178-236)	(178-235)
Leadership provided by grantee and staff	**.46[d]**	**.19[b]**
Advance notice for meetings	**.29[d]**	**.18[b]**
Communication between staff and other participants	**.46[d]**	**.27[d]**
Communication among SK/SS participants	**.38[d]**	.13
Convenience of meeting times	**.33[d]**	**.20[b]**
Process for deciding on SK/SS programs and priorities	**.42[d]**	**.21[b]**
Satisfaction with Decisions and Accomplishments (N)	(176-251)	(176-250)
Decisions made on SK/SS priorities	**.50[d]**	**.28[d]**
Decisions about which community programs to fund	**.43[d]**	**.15[a]**
Decisions about how and what aspects of SK/SS to sustain	**.43[d]**	**.24[c]**
Overall satisfaction with accomplishments	**.51[d]**	**.21[b]**
Effects of SK/SS So Far (N)	(220-256)	(219-255)
No. of personal benefits reported	**.39[d]**	.07
No. of large effects on own organization	**.40[d]**	.10
No. of strong effects on community	**.41[d]**	**.17[b]**
Significantly affected operations within own organization, overall	**.43[d]**	**.22[c]**
Significantly affected children and families served by own organization, overall	**.49[d]**	.10

[1] The statistic reported is the Spearman correlation coefficient.

[2] The formal child protection system includes respondents who identified themselves as representing CPS, law enforcement, prosecution, or court agencies.

Indicates correlations of .30 or higher.

Significance levels:

a = $p \leq .05$. c = $p \leq .001$.

b = $p \leq .01$. d = $p \leq .0001$.

Likelihood of Involvement

In 2001, we found that, in general, respondents who expected to continue their involvement:

- Reported more time spent on SK/SS in the past, more types of involvement, and more involvement in project committees or teams (but not the governing council or body);
- Were more satisfied with the decisions and accomplishments of SK/SS;

- Viewed SK/SS as more open to different viewpoints and more amenable to stakeholder influence;
- Were more satisfied with various aspects of the implementation process, especially the decisionmaking process;
- Reported more effects of SK/SS on themselves, their organization, and their community;
- Expected SK/SS to affect their organization or its clients in the future;
- Represented an organization that had received funds from SK/SS and/or had contributed staff to SK/SS efforts; and
- Had a higher level of authority in their own organization.

Of these factors, likelihood of involvement was most strongly correlated with the number of meetings attended in the past year and the hours spent per month on SK/SS. In other words, those who had invested the most time also were most likely to say that they would continue their involvement. This finding was consistent across all sites, and seemed to counter any suggestion that stakeholders were getting tired of participating in SK/SS and would be moving on to other things.

Two years later, our findings are quite similar. Most variables that were correlated with likelihood of involvement in 2001 were correlated in 2003, but usually the correlations were even stronger. The Spearman correlation coefficients in Table 3-20 are based on the entire pool of respondents.[39] The largest correlations were found for:

- Three measures of personal involvement—the number of SK/SS meetings attended in the past year ($r=.54$, $p\leq.0001$), the number of different types of involvement reported ($r=.51$, $p\leq.0001$), and the number of hours per month spent on SK/SS ($r=.45$, $p\leq.0001$);
- Overall satisfaction with accomplishments ($r=.51$, $p\leq.0001$) and with decisions made on priorities ($r=.50$, $p\leq.0001$);
- Satisfaction with project leadership and with communication between staff and other participants ($r=.46$ for both, $p\leq.0001$);
- Stakeholder perceptions that the project is open to different points of view ($r=.47$, $p\leq.0001$); and

[39] Site-specific results appear in Appendix Table C-8. In some cases, the site-specific relationships differed from the overall pattern. That is, a significant relationship in the overall pool was not significant at the site level, or a relationship was significant at one or more individual sites, but not overall.

- The perception that SK/SS has significantly affected children and families served by the respondent's organization (r=.49, p≤.0001).

Most of these relationships were statistically significant at the site level and overall.

Again, the findings suggest that SK/SS continues to retain the allegiance of its most involved stakeholders. Interestingly, however, in 2003 there was no longer any correlation between projected involvement and representing an organization that had received SK/SS funds, or between projected involvement and the respondent's level of authority for decisionmaking. One other departure from previous findings is that in the overall sample, projected involvement is modestly correlated with ratings of importance for all the SK/SS strategies (r=.21 to .29, p≤.001 to p≤.0001). It is also correlated with all the ratings of the dimensions of system reform, which were new in 2003—but most strongly with the dimensions of increasing communication and partnerships among agencies (r=.31, p≤.0001) and increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions (r=.32, p≤.0001). However, the relationships between projected involvement and ratings of the strategies and system reform dimensions were not consistently significant at the site level.

As in 2001, agency type was not related to expectations for future involvement overall or at most sites, with Toledo as a notable exception. In Toledo, representatives from public agencies and from the formal child protection system were less likely to say that they would be involved in the coming year, and representatives from private agencies were more likely to say so. In 2001, representatives of formal child protection agencies in Sault Ste. Marie had expected a lower likelihood of future involvement, but this relationship did not reappear in 2003.

Level of Involvement Expected

As in 2001, we observed far fewer relationships between the *level* of involvement expected next year (less, about the same, more) and the other factors that we identified as possible correlates. Where relationships reached statistical significance, the correlations are weaker, with none exceeding r=.28. The analyses found the strongest relationships, both overall and at most sites, in two areas. Respondents who were most satisfied with the decisions made on SK/SS priorities and decisions about how and what aspects of SK/SS to sustain were more likely to forecast increased involvement (r=.28, p≤.0001 and r=.24, p≤.001, respectively). Also, those who were more satisfied with communication between staff and other participants were

more likely to expect greater involvement ($r=.27$, $p\leq.0001$). As in 2001, those who felt that their time contribution had been inadequate in the past year tended to expect greater involvement in the future, and those who felt they had invested too much time expected to reduce their involvement ($r=-.22$, $p\leq.001$). These relationships were significant overall, but not at the site level.

Most other relationships were not strong enough to be significant at the site level. There were also site-specific variations. (See Appendix Table C-8.) The type of agency represented by the respondent was not related to expected level of involvement overall or at any site.

What Do Stakeholders Think Are the Most Significant Challenges Faced by Safe Kids/Safe Streets?

In 2003, we asked stakeholders to reflect on the challenges to carrying out the SK/SS goals and objectives and tell us which had never been significant, which had been significant at one time but not now, and which were significant now (or had always been significant). The 10 challenges we listed were drawn from the literature concerning collaborative experiences, as well as stakeholder responses to an open-ended question about challenges in the 2001 survey. The challenges included: limited resources, keeping up the momentum, turf issues, understanding/meeting the expectations of funders, lack of participation from key agencies or groups, defining a realistic agenda, leadership/staff turnover in key agencies or groups, and ineffective leadership. The results are shown in Table 3-21.

We first note that the majority of stakeholders thought 9 out of the 10 challenges on our list were significant at *some* time in the project history, if not now. If we order issues according to the proportion who saw them as a challenge at *any* time in the history of the project, limited resources rank first (92% said it was significant now or earlier), turf issue ranks second (81%), and keeping up the momentum comes in third (76%). However, if we look at the challenges seen as *currently* significant, turf issues drop to a distant third place—viewed as a current challenge by only 48 percent of respondents overall. In contrast, 85 percent of respondents overall still viewed limited resources as a challenge, and 66 percent continued to see keeping up the momentum as an issue.

Table 3-21. Significant Challenges Faced by SK/SS Collaboratives[1]

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Limited Resources (N)	(61)	(50)	(46)	(37)	(26)	**(220)**
Never significant	0%	2%	9%	22%	12%	**7%[b]**
Significant earlier, but not now	8	8	7	5	8	**7**
Significant now/always	92	90	85	73	81	**85**
Keeping up the momentum (N)	(55)	(42)	(41)	(42)	(27)	**(207)**
Never significant	31%	26%	17%	17%	26%	**24%[a]**
Significant earlier, but not now	16	5	5	5	22	**10**
Significant now/always	53	69	78	79	52	**66**
Understanding, meeting the expectations of funders (N)	(41)	(33)	(34)	(36)	(21)	**(165)**
Never significant	22%	33%	38%	22%	33%	**29%**
Significant earlier, but not now	34	12	15	25	19	**22**
Significant now/always	44	55	47	53	48	**49**
Turf issues (conflicting philosophies, interests, needs) (N)	(49)	(43)	(43)	(39)	(27)	**(201)**
Never significant	22%	14%	16%	26%	19%	**19%**
Significant earlier, but not now	35	42	30	28	26	**33**
Significant now/always	43	44	53	46	56	**48**
Lack of participation from key agencies or groups (N)	(53)	(44)	(46)	(39)	(27)	**(209)**
Never significant	38%	34%	28%	13%	30%	**29%**
Significant earlier, but not now	21	30	17	28	33	**25**
Significant now/always	42	36	54	59	37	**46**
Leadership/staff turnover in key agencies or groups (N)	(41)	(37)	(39)	(37)	(25)	**(179)**
Never significant	41%	43%	33%	41%	40%	**40%**
Significant earlier, but not now	24	14	13	14	16	**16**
Significant now/always	34	43	54	46	44	**44**
Defining a realistic agenda (N)	(50)	(42)	(44)	(36)	(22)	**(194)**
Never significant	44%	19%	34%	17%	41%	**31%[a]**
Significant earlier, but not now	24	43	18	33	23	**28**
Significant now/always	32	38	48	50	36	**41**
Ineffective leadership (N)	(54)	(37)	(44)	(37)	(23)	**(195)**
Never significant	56	62	45	43	65	**53[d]**
Significant earlier, but not now	39	16	14	11	17	**21**
Significant now/always	6	22	41	46	17	**26**

[1] Respondents ranked these items on a 4-point scale, where "1" stood for "Never significant," "2" for "Significant earlier, but not now," "3" for "Significant now," and "4" for "Always significant." Response categories "3" and "4" were combined for analysis.

Significance levels of χ^2:

a = $p \leq .05$. c = $p \leq .001$.

b = $p \leq .01$. d = $p \leq .0001$.

The least frequently reported challenge—currently or ever—was ineffective leadership. The majority of stakeholders overall (53%) reported that they had never viewed it as a significant challenge, 21 percent said it had been significant earlier (not now), and only 26 percent thought it was a challenge now. The sharpest cross-site differences emerged on this item, with stakeholders in Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie much more concerned about ineffective leadership currently than respondents from other sites. Burlington represented the other extreme, with only 6 percent of stakeholders viewing leadership as a current issue.

The cross-site analyses found statistically significant differences on just three of the other challenge measures. In Burlington and Huntsville, 90 percent or more of the respondents viewed limited resources as a significant issue, while just 73 percent thought so in Sault Ste. Marie. (The fact that Sault Ste. Marie was not as close to the end of Federal funding as most other sites may have influenced responses here, but cannot completely explain the pattern. Sault Ste. Marie had almost twice as many respondents as any other site say that limited resources had never been a significant challenge.) The challenge of keeping up the momentum was a current concern for more stakeholders in Sault Ste. Marie (79%), Kansas City (78%), and Huntsville (69%), than in Burlington (53%) and Toledo (52%).

The other challenge for which we observed statistically significant differences across sites was defining a realistic agenda. On this item, 44 percent of Burlington respondents said that this had never been a significant challenge, along with 41 percent of respondents from Toledo. Respondents from these sites were also the least likely to view it as a challenge now. Only 32 percent of Burlington stakeholders and 36 percent of Toledo respondents reported this concern. At the other extreme, just 17 percent of stakeholders in Sault Ste. Marie thought it had never been a challenge and half thought it was a challenge now. Huntsville was unusual for having a substantial minority (43%) of respondents who reported that defining the agenda had once been a challenge, but it was not a challenge now.

4. Summary, Discussion, and Conclusions

The existence of a broad-based community collaboration, willing and able to work toward reducing child abuse and neglect over a period of years, was central to the SK/SS vision. The sites began building their SK/SS collaboratives in 1997, when OJP funds were first awarded. By spring 2003, the collaboratives were in the late stages of SK/SS implementation. Three sites—Burlington, Huntsville, and Toledo—expected to exhaust their Federal funding by year's end (although transitional awards would later extend that timeframe). Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie were spending the fourth of their five expected awards.

Building on previous surveys in 1998 and 2001, the 2003 Stakeholder Survey was designed to help illuminate how the SK/SS collaboratives had performed during the later stages of SK/SS implementation and determine whether they were likely to retain the commitment of members during the coming year. The 2003 Stakeholder Survey, like the 2001 survey, targeted individuals who: (a) had received subgrant funding or served on a SK/SS task force, team, or council at some point since the program's inception and (b) had been involved in some way during the previous 2 years. Seventy-one percent of those surveyed responded, 277 of whom said they had been involved in the past 2 years. Analyses were based on the responses of these 277 people.

Overall Findings

In many respects, the 2003 respondents are similar to those from 2001. Like the 2001 respondents, they cover a wide gamut of agencies and institutional systems. Fifty-seven percent represent public or Tribal agencies (57%), and 26 percent, private service providers or other private agencies. The remainder represent community organizations or other "nontraditional" groups such as professional or civic organizations, parents, youth, and business. Many of these respondents have considerable authority to make decisions on behalf of their agencies. A substantial minority (44%) are long-term participants, involved in SK/SS since 1997 or 1998, and four out of five have been involved at least 2 years.

If these respondents are reasonably representative, there continue to be distinctive differences in the composition of the various collaboratives. As in 2001, Huntsville and Kansas City have much more nontraditional representation than the other sites. Burlington remains the only site where private agency representatives outnumber those from other sectors, while Sault

Ste. Marie is alone in having little or no involvement from private agencies. In Kansas City and Toledo, stakeholders from the formal child protection sphere (child protective services, law enforcement, prosecution, and family court) account for more of the agency representation than elsewhere. For Toledo, they now outnumber all other types of stakeholders.

Stakeholders remain quite supportive of the four Federal strategies or elements that form the OJP framework for SK/SS. In fact, opinions in 2003 remained remarkably similar to those expressed in the earlier surveys. Of the four strategies, "ensuring a full continuum of services" continues to be rated the most important (4.5 on a five-point scale), and "system reform" (or "reforming policies and procedures," as we phrased it previously) the least important (3.9). Enhancing public awareness and improving information systems and evaluation earn intermediate scores (4.2 and 4.0 respectively). This time, however, we asked respondents to rate several dimensions of system reform individually and found that most dimensions earned higher ratings than "system reform" in general. Among the individual dimensions of system reform, the respondents rated increasing communication and partnerships among professionals/agencies (4.4), making the court process work more effectively (4.2), increasing family involvement in decisionmaking (4.2), and increasing the cultural competency of agencies and staff (4.2) the highest.

In two sites, Huntsville and Sault Ste. Marie, respondents from the formal child protection system saw "system reform" and several of the specific reform dimensions as less important than other respondents did. Elsewhere, the opinions of those in the formal child protection system and other respondents were similar.

In 2003, about the same proportion of stakeholders as in 2001 came from organizations that had received SK/SS funds (37%) and/or contributed staff to SK/SS activities (50%). As before, stakeholders from organizations that had received funding were more likely to say that their agency had contributed staff time to SK/SS and were more likely to have been involved personally in the past year. Again, however, we also found that funding from SK/SS was not necessary to attract participants. Many stakeholders whose organizations had never received SK/SS funding were involved several hours a month, and 38 percent reported that their organizations had contributed staff to SK/SS efforts. Fourteen percent of respondents reported that their organizations had contributed financial support to SK/SS, compared to just 6 percent in 2001. Most of these respondents were from Burlington and Toledo.

Overall, we saw no evidence that commitment to SK/SS had eroded during the late stages of implementation. The typical stakeholder was involved in at least two different types of SK/SS activities, spent 2 hours a month on SK/SS, and attended five meetings in the previous year—almost identical to reports in 2001. As before, the level of intensity varied. Twenty-three percent of the stakeholders averaged at least one meeting a month, 19 percent spent 6 hours or more per month, and 19 percent reported four or more types of involvement. Attending community meetings, serving on the project's governing body, and serving on other committees were the most common types of involvement—not surprising, given that our survey primarily targeted those who had served on committees or councils.

Although most respondents found it at least somewhat difficult to find time to participate in SK/SS, 55 percent thought they would be involved in SK/SS during the upcoming year. Only 16 percent expected to be less involved than in the past year. The majority (56%) think it is likely that the SK/SS collaborative will continue beyond the period of Federal funding, and optimism about the collaborative's future is strongly correlated with the likelihood of future involvement. As in 2001, those who had been most involved in the past year also were the most likely to say they would continue their involvement.

As in previous surveys, we found ample reason for the continued allegiance of stakeholders:

- Stakeholders overall were quite satisfied with the implementation process, including project leadership, communication, convenience of meetings, the decisionmaking process, and the decisions made. On most items repeated from previous surveys, satisfaction went up slightly, though not as much as in 2001. Seventy-nine percent of stakeholders expressed no serious dissatisfaction on any of the items; 11 percent had only one complaint.

- When asked about the adequacy of "investments" in implementation during the past year—including time contributed, data availability, strategic planning, Federal guidance and TA, and involvement by various groups—most stakeholders felt that the investments had been "about right." Generally, satisfaction with investments was up slightly from 2001. The only exception occurred for adequacy of resources, where just 48 percent felt that resources had been about right.

- Stakeholders continued to give SK/SS high marks on openness to different points of view. They indicated that they had considerable influence over goals and objectives, with somewhat less influence over funding decisions and program operations.

- Most stakeholders said that they had personally benefitted from their involvement with SK/SS, typically through increasing their contacts in the child abuse and neglect field or other areas. Compared to 2001, there were consistent increases at all sites, sometimes quite large, in the proportion of stakeholders reporting that they had received new training because of SK/SS.

- Seventy-three percent of stakeholders reported at least one significant effect on their agency's operations as a result of SK/SS, and 38 percent reported five or more. The most commonly reported effects were in the areas of interagency communication, communication with community members, training and professional development, expansion of the scope of services/activities, and the quality or amount of information available for decisionmaking. About one-third reported that SK/SS had significantly affected their operations overall.

- Over half the stakeholders reported that SK/SS has significantly affected the children and families served by their organization.

- The vast majority of stakeholders reported that SK/SS had affected their community in several ways. Nine out of ten reported at least one strong effect; two-thirds report seven or more effects, an increase over 2001. Effects spanned all four strategy areas in the SK/SS framework. The most frequently reported effects included improved communication and cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect, improved multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence, expanded prevention programs, improved information-sharing and case tracking across agencies, and better community education about child abuse and neglect.

- Opinions differed about which of the community effects were most important, although improving communication and cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect was ranked in the top five everywhere and took first place in Burlington, Huntsville, and Kansas City. In Sault Ste. Marie, effects on communication and cooperation ranked third, behind educating community residents about child abuse and neglect and making professionals/services more ethnically and culturally sensitive. In Toledo, it ranked second after improving information and case-tracking across agencies.

- Two-thirds of the respondents expressed satisfaction with the overall accomplishments of SK/SS, awarding ratings in the 4 to 5 range on a 5-point scale. The percentage who were very satisfied was lowest in Sault Ste. Marie (49%) and Toledo (59%) and highest in Huntsville (79%). Burlington (70%) and Kansas City (65%) fell in between. Although these cross-site differences were statistically significant, the gap between sites was narrower than in 2001, primarily because satisfaction levels had increased in Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie.

Overall and at most sites, the analyses found no relationship between the type of agency represented by a respondent and the individual's satisfaction with the project's accomplishments or the probability of continued involvement in the project. In an interesting

departure from the 2001 findings, however, stakeholders from organizations that had received SK/SS funds were no more satisfied with accomplishments than other respondents and no more likely to say that they would continue their involvement.

As in 2001, service on the SK/SS governing body was largely unrelated to either satisfaction with accomplishments or to expectations of continued involvement. Instead, the breadth and quantity of a respondent's involvement (in terms of number of different types of activity, hours spent, and meetings attended) continued to be significant factors.

Challenges

When asked to reflect on the challenges faced by SK/SS over its history, stakeholders reported many challenges typical of other collaborative enterprises. At the time of the survey, stakeholders said the most significant challenges were limited resources (reported by 85% of respondents), keeping up the momentum (66%), and understanding/meeting the expectations of funders (49%). Forty-eight percent of respondents thought turf issues were a current challenge as well, and another third said that they had been significant earlier but were no longer a significant issue. Most respondents did not have concerns about ineffective leadership. Fifty-three percent thought ineffective leadership had never been a significant challenge, and only 26 percent thought it was a challenge now.

The overall results point to other areas where sites face some continuing challenges.

Participation by Nontraditional Stakeholders

The participation of nontraditional stakeholders represents an important part of the vision for SK/SS—and it was constantly reinforced through cluster conferences and communications from the Federal program officers and TA providers. We know from the process evaluation that sites worked on this in several ways—recruiting more community members for governing boards and task forces, building capacity for community involvement through training, and involving community members as advisors to specific activities or projects. However, the 2003 Stakeholder Survey indicates that there is still work to do.

- Judging from the characteristics of the 2003 respondents, the trend toward greater diversification in collaboration membership appears to have slowed or stopped in most sites. While the proportion of respondents with nontraditional affiliations remained stable in Huntsville and grew slightly in Kansas City, it declined elsewhere. While the small changes in Burlington and Sault Ste. Marie could have occurred by chance, those in Toledo were dramatic. Toledo respondents were much less diverse than in 2001. Public agency representatives now dominated the respondent pool, and nearly all of them came from the formal child protection system. There were hardly any nontraditional respondents.

- Continuing a pattern from 2001, while most stakeholders felt generally satisfied with most aspects of the implementation process, a sizable minority (37%) felt that there had been insufficient community involvement in the past year. On the positive side, dissatisfaction levels on this measure declined from 64 percent to 44 percent in Burlington and from 40 percent to 24 percent in Kansas City. However, these were offset by increases in Toledo, from 41 percent to 58 percent—perhaps reflecting the change in the mix of stakeholders. Dissatisfaction levels in Huntsville (27%) and Sault Ste. Marie (44%) remained similar to those in 2001.

- Over a third of stakeholders felt that there had been insufficient cultural/ethnic diversity among participants in SK/SS. As in 2001, dissatisfaction was not equally distributed across sites, and Huntsville and Sault Ste. Marie respondents continued to be the least dissatisfied (12% and 15% respectively). Burlington stakeholders remained the most dissatisfied, although dissatisfaction dropped from 71 to 58 percent. Dissatisfaction in Kansas City also dropped somewhat, from 28 to 19 percent. However, in Toledo, dissatisfied stakeholders increased from 33 to 41 percent.

System Change

Tension between the local desire to expand services and the pressure from sponsors to also address system reform has been a continuing theme of the SK/SS demonstration. In the previous surveys, we noted that system reform consistently rated lower in importance than other elements in the SK/SS framework. However, our previous concerns about the lower interest in system reform vis-à-vis the other program strategies may have been somewhat overstated—a result of the way we worded our questions. Anyway, our new questions about specific dimensions of system reform suggest that many types of system reform are valued as much or more than other program strategies, although ensuring a full continuum of services continues to hold first place.

Looking at results, it also is encouraging that stakeholders reported more effects on the community than in 2001, especially in Burlington, Kansas City, and Sault Ste. Marie.

However, when reporting on their own organizations, stakeholders more often saw changes in communication, training/professional development, information-sharing, and other areas that might be considered short- or midterm results of SK/SS. As in 2001, they were least likely to report changes in routine procedures, caseloads, staffing assignments, and budget priorities. Toledo was the only site where appreciably more respondents (ranging from 27 to 37% in 2003) reported these types of changes. In terms of the overall logic of systems change, therefore, SK/SS had not yet made large inroads on some of the longer term challenges within the respondents' own organizations.

Stakeholder Relations

As in 2001, few stakeholders expressed profound dissatisfaction , and for the most part, those who did could not be distinguished by agency type, authority level, involvement, or funding experience. However, dissatisfied respondents are somewhat more likely than other respondents to suggest ways that SK/SS could make their participation easier. Overall, about one in five respondents had suggestions for making participation easier. The most common suggestions related to meeting times, notice for meetings, or length of meetings, and to the level of communication and followup. These results provide a valuable reminder that sites need to ask their stakeholders from time to time how they are doing and, where possible, make adjustments.

Site-Specific Patterns

We have noted several site-specific findings above. There are numerous other results of interest, many of them encouraging, along with a few that may flag areas for further attention by Federal and site staff.

Huntsville

Huntsville stakeholders continued to report high levels of satisfaction with the implementation process and its accomplishments, more large effects on their own organizations, and more significant effects of SK/SS on the community. The mix of stakeholders and their level of involvement have been relatively constant, with Huntsville involving a high percentage of stakeholders outside the formal child protection system. However, only in Huntsville did the proportion of respondents who expected to remain involved in the coming year drop

appreciably (from 63% in 2001 to 48% in 2003). Huntsville respondents more often viewed limited resources as a current challenge, although this was a prominent concern almost everywhere.

Burlington

Burlington respondents remained the most dissatisfied with the ethnic/cultural diversity of participants in SK/SS and the level of community involvement. However, as noted above, dissatisfaction in both areas declined appreciably from 2001 levels. In general, 2003 stakeholders expressed more satisfaction with leadership and other aspects of implementation than in 2001, with levels approaching or equaling Huntsville's on many items. Ratings of openness and influence over program operations increased, as did the proportion reporting that SK/SS had improved the ability to do one's job. Respondents also reported more community effects. There were especially large increases in the proportions reporting that SK/SS had made professionals/services more culturally sensitive and had improved information sharing and case tracking. More of the 2003 respondents reported that they would be involved in SK/SS in the coming year (60% vs. 49% in 2001). Among all the sites, more Burlington respondents had concerns about resources. It was the only site where a majority (58%) felt that resources had been inadequate in the past year and where almost everyone (92%) saw limited resources as a current challenge as well. However, few Burlington respondents saw ineffective leadership as a current challenge (6%).

Sault Ste. Marie

Stakeholders in Sault Ste. Marie continued to be the least satisfied with the SK/SS implementation process and its accomplishments. They also continued to report the fewest community effects and reported fewer effects on their own organizations than all but one other site. Nonetheless, there were several positive changes. Satisfaction with the implementation process was up slightly over 2001 levels, and respondents were more likely to report organizational effects. More respondents in 2003 reported significant community effects, with the largest increases occurring for improving multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence and improving case management and followup. Equally encouraging, 51 percent of Sault Ste. Marie respondents said that they were likely to be involved in SK/SS in the coming year, compared to just 36 percent in 2001. Sault Ste. Marie respondents also more often said that they would be increasing their involvement in the coming year. While fewer Sault Ste.

Marie respondents saw limited resources as a current challenge than respondents from other sites, more of them expressed concerns about keeping up the momentum, defining a realistic agenda, and ineffective leadership.

Kansas City

In 2001, Kansas City stakeholders had been almost as dissatisfied with overall accomplishments and many aspects of the implementation process as stakeholders from Sault Ste. Marie. They also had reported the fewest personal benefits from SK/SS participation. Although they remained among the least satisfied in 2003, Kansas City respondents expressed greater satisfaction with leadership and other aspects of implementation than before. Also, ratings of openness to different points of view and stakeholder influence on goals and objectives were up, as was satisfaction with the amount of community involvement. Further, the proportion of respondents reporting that SK/SS had increased the ability to do one's job went up considerably. Although the reports of organizational effects declined compared to 2001, reports of community effects increased. Kansas City was also the only site besides Sault Ste. Marie to have a fair number of respondents (24%) say that they would be increasing their involvement in the coming year. Like Sault Ste. Marie, more of the Kansas City respondents viewed keeping up the momentum, defining a realistic agenda, and ineffective leadership as current challenges.

Toledo

Toledo has always been unique in having received substantially less funding than the other sites. However, in 2001, its stakeholders were not distinctive on most measures of involvement and opinions about SK/SS, although they did report unusually low levels of decisionmaking authority. In 2003, many things changed. As noted above, the stakeholder mix changed—shifting dramatically toward formal child protection agencies and away from nontraditional representation. At the same time, stakeholder levels of authority increased noticeably. Activity levels were also up—with stakeholders reporting more types of involvement and many more meetings (10 per year vs. 4 in 2001). Stakeholders expressed slightly more satisfaction with the implementation process and reported more organizational effects. However, they had become the most dissatisfied with level of community involvement and were among the most dissatisfied with ethnic/cultural diversity—in both cases, the shift was large. They also reported somewhat fewer community effects than before, on average, and for several specific effects, the proportion reporting them dropped sharply. Completing this "good

news/bad news" picture, Toledo respondents in 2003 more often forecast continued involvement than in 2001 (75% expected to remain involved vs. 50% previously). Unlike the other sites, Toledo respondents placed two effects from the data collection and evaluation sphere—improved information-sharing and case-tracking and standardizing data collection—among their top five accomplishments.

Limitations of Findings

SK/SS is a complex, dynamic initiative, shaped by many influences. Stakeholder Surveys provide just one method of assessing its progress. Over the longer term, survey results must be integrated with other findings from the national evaluation about the achievements and limitations of the SK/SS approach. We have done that in Volume I of this report.

Also, although our survey response rates were respectable, we cannot be sure that those who responded necessarily represent those who had been involved but failed to complete a survey. And the stakeholders we surveyed were by definition among the more active participants in SK/SS because we deliberately selected them from lists of those who had received funds or served on project committees or councils. However, we believe they were the best equipped to comment on the collaborative's performance, and they were far too numerous to constitute some small inner circle of project cheerleaders.

Finally, it is important to recognize that neither the survey itself nor the literature on collaboration provides an objective yardstick to assess some dimensions of the survey results. For example, we do not know the "right" or "sufficient" level of satisfaction to sustain or broaden an effective collaboration. Presumably, high levels of dissatisfaction are undesirable, but some level of discontent or disagreement may be healthy, signifying that a collaborative is tackling tough issues. Similarly, we have no objective standard for the optimal level of member continuity or turnover. Finally, certain indicators of implementation weakness may have a positive dimension. For example, the fact that many stakeholders are concerned about lack of community involvement or cultural diversity may represent a step forward for some communities.

Conclusions

Keeping these caveats in mind, we believe that the 2003 stakeholder survey lends support to several general conclusions. First, the findings corroborate a key finding from other aspects of the process evaluation. **The central element of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets model—a broad-based community collaboration—can be implemented with reasonable fidelity to OJP expectations.** Such a collaboration can grow and diversify over time, and it can retain the commitment of its members, although it may continue to struggle with certain tasks.

Second, as with previous surveys, the findings highlight some specific aspects of collaboration practice that contribute to stakeholder satisfaction and are worth emulating elsewhere. Openness to different points of view, creating a climate in which stakeholders feel they have real influence, good communication between staff and stakeholders—all these appear important. Furthermore, there are strong indications that stakeholders can and should be engaged in many different ways, not just through inviting them to serve on a governing body. Opportunities to participate in working committees or develop training may actually be more powerful routes to continued involvement. It is also heartening that funding his or her agency is not necessary to ensure a stakeholder's involvement in a collaboration, although we cannot rule out the role of resources in attracting people to the table initially. In fact, in 2003, receipt of SK/SS funds was no longer strongly correlated with opinions about SK/SS or the likelihood of future participation. We also saw evidence in at least two sites, Burlington and Toledo, of increasing local financial support from the organizations that stakeholders represent.

Finally, in Sault Ste. Marie and Kansas City, implementation has moved more slowly than elsewhere, and levels of satisfaction and reports of accomplishments continue to be lower as well. However, as noted above, there are hopeful signs in the form of several positive changes in opinions about SK/SS and its accomplishments and, equally important, indications that many stakeholders plan to stay involved or increase their involvement in the coming year.

APPENDIX A

Methodology for the Third Stakeholder Survey

APPENDIX A

Methodology for the Third Stakeholder Survey

Westat conducted a mail survey of stakeholders at all five sites, focusing on those who had participated in implementation during the past 2 years. The survey was fielded in February 2003.

Purpose of the survey. The third stakeholder survey aimed to:

- Systematically determine how stakeholders had been involved in Safe Kids/Safe Streets (SK/SS) implementation across sites, their experiences and reactions to it, and their perceptions of its effects on their communities and their own organizations;
- Identify factors that distinguish stakeholders who are most engaged and active;
- Help individual sites identify strengths and weaknesses;[40]
- Identify changes in stakeholder characteristics, experiences, and perceptions over time.

Survey design. The survey design was similar to that used for the first and second Stakeholder Surveys, conducted in fall 1998 and early 2001, respectively. Procedures for conducting the third Stakeholder Survey and handling the data were reviewed and approved by Westat's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The survey instrument consisted of 27 questions, designed for mail administration. The final question was open-ended and optional. The remaining questions asked the respondent to check or circle the most appropriate response; in several cases, selection of "other" response also called for filling in a blank to explain. Where meaningful, items from the 1998 and 2001 surveys were repeated using similar or identical wording. Westat developed new items to elicit opinions about the program's most important accomplishments, its most important challenges, and its likelihood of survival after Federal support ends. (See the final survey form and cover letter, Appendix B).

[40] Westat will provide each site with its own survey results and if requested, a dataset suitable for further analyses.

Appendix A. Methodology for the Third Stakeholder Survey

The final survey was mailed to 491 individuals who were believed to have participated in the implementation of the local SK/SS projects. The individuals contacted included members of the governing board, individuals participating on task forces and project committees, and subgrantees not included in the previous groups (if any). These were the same categories of individuals targeted by the 2001 survey.

The mailing list consisted of the mailing list for the 2001 survey, plus persons who had joined project teams or received grants since then and minus persons who were known to have moved away or been inactive in SK/SS for at least 2 years. Project staff assisted us in editing the lists. When in doubt about someone's recent involvement in the project, we left him or her on the list. Overall, 62 percent of the persons on the 2003 list had also been on the 2001 list. Toledo had the least overlap with its previous survey list (36%), followed by Sault Ste. Marie (52%). The greatest overlap occurred in Huntsville (74%), with Burlington (70%) and Kansas City (65%) close behind. In the cover letter, we asked stakeholders who had not been active in the last 2 years or were mistakenly included in the list (i.e., had never been involved) to mark the survey "Not involved in years" or "Not involved" and return it to us.

Although the 2003 survey list contained many new names, it had about the same proportion of representatives from public agencies as the previous survey list (50% vs. 49% in 2001). It also had about the same proportion of individuals who had served on the SK/SS governing body at some time (34% vs. 32%). As shown in Table A-1, there are some noteworthy differences at the site level, however. In particular, the Toledo list contains a larger proportion of representatives from public agencies than before (57% in 2003 vs. 41% in 2001). Both the Huntsville and Kansas City lists contain much larger proportions of representatives with experience on the governing body than before (39% vs. 24% for Huntsville, 67% vs. 52% for Kansas City).

The surveys were mailed in February 2003. Surveys were customized to use the distinctive local name of each project in the questionnaire and the cover letter from Westat. In addition to Westat's letter, we included a letter from the local project director to encourage completion of the survey.

Table A-1. Comparison of 2001 and 2003 Survey Lists

Characteristic	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	All Sites
% from Public Agencies						
-2001	31%	49%	40%	85%	41%	49%
-2003	28	41	42	93	57%	50%
% who have served on SK/SS governing body						
-2001	26%	24%	52%	28%	35%	32%
-2003	29	39	67	25	27	34%

Each survey contained a unique tracking number that identified the respondent, to enable targeted followup to nonrespondents.[41] However, all data were to be treated as confidential, and no personal identifiers would remain in the final dataset**.** A reminder postcard was sent to nonrespondents approximately 3 weeks after the initial mailing. A second survey and letter were mailed to nonrespondents 3 weeks after that. Finally, a third survey was mailed to nonrespondents in early April. In this last letter, Westat included a Federal Express return envelope and mailing label, with shipping to be paid by Westat.

Response rates. Response rates for the survey are shown in Table A-2 below. The statistics are based on statistics on 486 surveys, not the original number of 491, because we belatedly discovered that five respondents had moved away and should not have been on the mailing list. We received responses from 343 of the 486 people on our corrected mailing list, or 71% of the overall total. Response rates were 69% in Burlington, 66% in Huntsville, 72% in Kansas City, 74% in Sault Ste. Marie, and 75% in Toledo. Because 66 recipients (14%) responded that they had not been involved with the project during our target period, we ended up with 277 usable surveys, representing 57% of the mailing list or 66% of the mailing list after removing those who had not been involved (277/420).

Based on limited information about the characteristics of individuals on the mailing lists, we compared respondents and nonrespondents to the survey as to:

[41] Tracking numbers were also used in the second stakeholder survey but not in the first. We believe the omission of tracking numbers depressed the response rates for the first survey because it limited us to global follow-ups.

Table A-2. Response Rates for Third Stakeholder Survey

Site	Total mailed[1]	Questionnaires returned		Questionnaires completed		Indicated not involved for years	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%
Burlington, VT	123	85	69	71	58	14	11
Huntsville, AL	118	78	66	62	53	16	14
Kansas City, MO	92	66	72	58	63	8	9
Sault Ste. Marie, MI	97	72	74	55	57	17	18
Toledo, OH	56	42	75	31	55	11	20
Total	486	343	71	277	57	66	14

[1] Excludes five surveys that were returned because the addressee had moved, and we were unable to obtain another local mailing address. Had we known this in advance, we would have excluded them from the mailing along with others known to have left the area.

- Whether they were on the 2001 mailing list and thus among the earlier participants in SK/SS;[42]
- Whether they represented a public agency; and
- Whether they had served on the SK/SS governing body at some time.

The results are shown in Table A-3. We found that overall, those who completed the survey were about as likely to have come from the 2001 survey list as the total pool of survey recipients (60% vs. 62%). Also, those who completed the survey were about as likely to have come from a public agency as the total pool of survey recipients (49% vs. 50%). At the site level, these patterns varied slightly. Survey completers were slightly less likely to come from the 2001 list in Burlington and Kansas City. And in Huntsville, public agency respondents were somewhat less likely to provide completed surveys than other respondents. None of these differences seemed large enough to distort our results.

On the other hand, overall, those who completed the survey were slightly more likely to have served on the SK/SS governing body than the total pool of survey recipients (41% vs. 34% overall). We had expected a difference in this direction, on the assumption that members of the governing body would probably be more interested in the survey and more motivated to share their views with us. These differences occurred for all sites except Sault Ste. Marie, although they were tiny in Burlington.

[42] Because of the limited funding Toledo received, they were not included in the Year 1 national evaluation. Consequently, Toledo stakeholders were not surveyed in 1998.

Table A-3. Characteristics of 2003 Survey Recipients and Respondents

Characteristic	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	All Sites
% of Survey Recipients on Previous Survey List	70%	74%	65%	52%	36%	62%
% who completed 2003 survey	63%	74%	59%	53%	39%	60%
% of Survey Recipients from Public Agencies	28%	41%	42%	93%	57%	50%
% who completed 2003 survey	27%	35%	45%	93%	55%	49%
% of Survey Recipients Who Have Served on SK/SS Governing Body	29%	39%	67%	25%	27%	34%
% who completed 2003 survey	31%	44%	71%	24%	32%	41%

The overrepresentation of governing body members in several of the sites could affect our results if stakeholders involved in governance had views that were distinctive from those of other participants. Indeed, we found that stakeholders in those sites did not hold opinions about SK/SS that were consistently different from those of their fellow stakeholders. (There were more differences of opinion in Sault Ste. Marie, where governing body members were not overrepresented.) Stakeholders who had served on the governing body did, however, report more types of involvement in SK/SS than other stakeholders.

Analyses. Survey forms were reviewed as they came in, and codes were developed for the open-ended, optional question #27 and for "other" responses. Question #27 was coded by two independent raters, who discussed each coding disagreement and arrived at consensus.

Survey forms were then entered in an electronic database for analysis. Initial runs were conducted to identify inconsistent or out-of-range values, before proceeding to final analyses. All analyses were conducted using SAS.

Analytic techniques varied depending upon the data involved. Two methods were used to make cross-site comparisons. When cross-tabulations were used to compare categorical data, the chi-square statistic (χ^2) was used to test whether differences in the frequency distribution of responses across sites were larger than one would expect by chance. Tables indicate when the chi-square statistics are significant at the .05 level.

Analysis of variance techniques (ANOVA) were used to compare cross-site differences in mean responses on various items, using the F-test to measure the significance of differences. Tables indicate when the differences are significant at the .05 level. ANOVA procedures also included Tukey's Studentized Range Test and Bonferroni t-tests to determine whether differences between means for one individual site and another were significant. (These contrast with χ^2 or F, which only test whether there were cross-site differences overall.) The individual comparisons are not reported in the tables, but were taken into account in deciding which between-site differences to highlight in the text.

The degree of association between two variables was calculated using the Spearman correlation coefficient (r). This coefficient can vary from –1 to +1, with a correlation of 0 indicating that there is no statistical association between the variables. When a correlation between two variables is plus or minus 1, it is possible to perfectly predict the response on one variable from knowledge of the response on the other. When there is no association between two variables (r=.00) knowing one variable does not improve one's ability to predict the value of the other variable. Tables indicate when correlations are significant at the .05 level.[43]

[43] The survey did not sample stakeholders, but was mailed to all those who met our criteria—that is, involvement in grants, councils, or task forces and possible activity during the last 2 years. Therefore, tests of significance are used exclusively to indicate whether differences among sites are greater than chance differences that might have occurred among respondents who were randomly assigned to subpopulations. The tests are not used to make statements about some larger population. (Blalock, 1972).

APPENDIX B

Letter and Questionnaire

WESTAT
AN EMPLOYEE-OWNED RESEARCH CORPORATION

1650 Research Boulevard • Rockville, Maryland 20850-3195
tel. 301-251-1500 • fax 301-294-2040 • www.westat.com

February 14, 2003

[Name/address of community participant]

Dear [Name]

We are writing to ask your help in the final phase of our evaluation of the [Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program] in [City] and four other communities. [Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program] was awarded a Safe Kids/Safe Streets cooperative agreement, funded through the [Funding Office] in the U.S. Department of Justice. As the national evaluators of that program, we are very interested in getting your feedback about the program and finding out how you have been involved lately. We know that your involvement may have changed since the program was initiated. However, if you have **never** been involved in [SK/SS project], we ask that you return the blank survey in the enclosed envelope and write "Never Involved" at the top, so that we do not bother you again. If you have not been involved in the last two years, return the blank survey in the enclosed envelope and write "Not involved in years" at the top.

Our questionnaire is designed to help Westat and the Department of Justice evaluate and improve the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program, as well as help other communities that are struggling with the problems of child abuse and neglect. While your participation is voluntary, your answers are important to ensure the comprehensiveness and validity of the survey. Your answers will be kept confidential, and only aggregated survey responses will be presented in reports and tabulations. No information that can be identified with an individual respondent will be released in any form.

We recognize the time demands required by the project, but ask that you take an additional 15 minutes and complete this questionnaire. Do not be concerned if others who work with you have received the same survey. We are interested in your individual views. Please return the survey in the envelope that has been provided.

Please do not write your name or any other identifying information on the form. The identification number on the form is for tracking purposes only, so that we can send reminders and accurately report response rates. The only identifying information we will include in the analyses is the city from which the responses came. The data will be used to examine and compare community efforts across the five sites where the Safe Kids/Safe Streets initiative has been implemented. We will also share aggregated results with [SK/SS Project] staff in [City].

If you have any questions you may contact [SK/SS local project director] at [phone number] or me at (301) 738-3610. We will be happy to address any questions you might have.

Thank you for your help in this effort.

Sincerely,

Frances Gragg
Project Director
National Evaluation of Safe Kids/Safe Streets

Enclosure

Survey of [SK/SS Project] Community Participants

1. When did you personally first become involved with [SK/SS Project]? <Please estimate. Check one only.>

   r 1 1997
   r 2 1998
   r 3 1999
   r 4 2000
   r 5 2001
   r 6 2002

2. What type of agency or group do you represent? <Check one only.>

   r 01 Public or government agency (except Tribal)
   r 02 Tribal agency
   r 03 Private service provider or other private agency
   r 04 Community or neighborhood organization
   r 05 Professional or civic organization
   r 06 Religious organization or faith community
   r 07 Private foundation
   r 08 Parents or families
   r 09 Youth
   r 10 Neighborhood residents
   r 11 Business community
   r 12 Other (please specify) _____

3. If you represent a public or private agency, what type of agency is it? <Check one only.>

   r 01 Child protective services
   r 02 Law enforcement
   r 03 Family or juvenile court
   r 04 Criminal court
   r 05 Prosecution
   r 06 Corrections
   r 07 Family services
   r 08 Day care or preschool education
   r 09 Elementary or secondary education
   r 10 College or university
   r 11 Health
   r 12 Mental health
   r 13 Youth services
   r 14 Other (please specify) _____
   r 15 NOT APPLICABLE: I don't represent an agency

4. In the past year, what kind of involvement have you had in [SK/SS Project]? <Check all that apply.>

   r 01 Served on the [SK/SS governing body]
   r 02 Served on another project committee, team or task force
   r 03 Attended community meetings convened by the project
   r 04 Helped develop training or made presentations for the project
   r 05 Helped select groups to receive funding from [SK/SS Project]
   r 06 Helped write proposals, plans, or other documents supporting [SK/SS Project] efforts
   r 07 Implemented activities funded by [SK/SS Project]
   r 08 Other (please specify _____ _____)

5. In the past year, how much time have you personally spent on [SK/SS Project] meetings or other related activities, excluding time spent implementing [SK/SS Project] funded grants? <Give an average.>

   About _____ hours a month

6. In the past year, approximately how many [SK/SS Project] meetings have you personally attended? <Count all meetings, large or small, organized or sponsored by the project.>

   About _____ meetings in the past year

7. In the past year, how difficult was it for you to make time to participate in [SK/SS Project]? (Circle one)

Not at all difficult				Extremely difficult
1	2	3	4	5

8. What authority do you have to make decisions on behalf of your organization at [SK/SS Project] meetings? <Circle one.>

None				Authority to commit agency resources/staff	Does Not Apply
1	2	3	4	5	6

9. If you represent an agency or organization, has your agency or organization ever: <Check all that apply.>

   r 1 Received any [SK/SS Project] funds?
   r 2 Had a proposal for [SK/SS Project] funds rejected?
   r 3 Provided financial support to [SK/SS Project]?
   r 4 Assigned/contributed staff to conduct [SK/SS Project] activities?
   r 5 DOES NOT APPLY. I do not represent an agency or organization
   r 6 None of the above

10. As a result of participating in [SK/SS Project], have you personally: <Check all that apply.>

   r 1 Made new contacts in the child abuse and neglect field?
   r 2 Made new contacts in the juvenile justice field?
   r 3 Made new contacts in other fields?
   Please specify _____>
   r 4 Received any new training?
   r 5 Increased your ability to do your job effectively?
   r 6 None of the above

11. Thinking of [SK/SS Project] over the past year, how satisfied are you with:

	Not at all satisfied				Extremely satisfied	No opinion
a. The leadership provided by [the grantee] and staff	1	2	3	4	5	8
b. Communication between project staff and other [SK/SS Project] participants	1	2	3	4	5	8
c. Convenience of meeting times	1	2	3	4	5	8
d. Advance notice for meetings	1	2	3	4	5	8
e. Communication among [SK/SS Project] participants	1	2	3	4	5	8
f. Decisions made on [SK/SS Project] priorities	1	2	3	4	5	8
g. Decisions made about which community programs to fund	1	2	3	4	5	8
h. The process for deciding on [SK/SS Project] programs and priorities	1	2	3	4	5	8
i. Decisions about how and what aspects of [SK/SS Project] will be sustained	1	2	3	4	5	8

12. How much influence do you feel the stakeholders in the [SK/SS Project] collaborative have over? <Circle one.>

	No influence at all				A great deal of influence
a. Overall goals and objectives	1	2	3	4	5
b. Funding decisions	1	2	3	4	5
c. Program operations	1	2	3	4	5

13. How open is [SK/SS Project] to considering different points of view? <Circle one.>

Not at all open				Extremely open
1	2	3	4	5

14. Thinking of the past year of [SK/SS Project], how did you feel about the:

	Not enough		About right		Too much
a. Amount of time you yourself contributed	1	2	3	4	5
b. Amount of time your agency or organization contributed	1	2	3	4	5
c. Amount of resources available to [SK/SS Project]	1	2	3	4	5
d. Amount of data available to guide decisions	1	2	3	4	5
e. Amount of effort spent on strategic planning	1	2	3	4	5
f. Amount of guidance and technical assistance from Federal sponsors	1	2	3	4	5
g. Amount of involvement by professionals and agencies	1	2	3	4	5
h. Amount of community involvement (individuals, neighborhood groups, churches, businesses, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
i. Cultural/ethnic diversity of participants in [SK/SS Project]	1	2	3	4	5

15. Thinking just of your own organization, has involvement in [SK/SS Project]:

	Not at all				A great deal	Does not apply
a. Changed your routine procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Changed how your agency communicates with other agencies or organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Altered staffing assignments	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Expanded the scope of services/activities	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. Narrowed the scope of services/activities	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Increased caseloads	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Lowered caseloads	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Increased money/staff available for services	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. Decreased money/staff available for services	1	2	3	4	5	6
j. Changed your budget priorities	1	2	3	4	5	6
k. Improved training/professional development	1	2	3	4	5	6
l. Increased the amount or quality of information available for making decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6
m. Improved communication with						
- Clients	1	2	3	4	5	6
- Community members	1	2	3	4	5	6
- Other organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6
n. Made your agency more accessible to cultural/ ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5	6

16. Overall, would you say that [SK/SS Project] has

a. Significantly affected operations within your own organization?

Not at all				A great deal	Does not apply
1	2	3	4	5	6

b. Significantly impacted children and families served by your organization?

Not at all				A great deal	Does not apply
1	2	3	4	5	6

17. The Federal initiative for the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program supports four general strategies. Please rate their importance for your community.

	Not at all important				Extremely important
a. System reform	1	2	3	4	5
b. Ensuring a full range of services is available for child abuse and neglect, from prevention to treatment	1	2	3	4	5
c. Improving information systems and evaluation to guide decision-making	1	2	3	4	5
d. Enhancing public awareness	1	2	3	4	5

18. One of the Federal strategies—"system reform"—has many dimensions. Please rate the importance of the following dimensions for your community.

	Not at all important				Extremely important
a. Reforming policies and procedures	1	2	3	4	5
b. Increasing communication and partnerships among professionals/agencies	1	2	3	4	5
c. Improving cross-disciplinary training and skills	1	2	3	4	5
d. Making the court process work more effectively	1	2	3	4	5
e. Increasing family involvement in decisionmaking	1	2	3	4	5
f. Increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement	1	2	3	4	5
g. Increasing the cultural competency of agencies & staff	1	2	3	4	5
h. Increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions	1	2	3	4	5

19. The Federal Safe Kids/Safe Streets program has many goals and objectives related to child abuse and neglect. Not all sites are placing the same emphasis on each one. So far in your community, do you believe [SK/SS Project] has had any effect on?

	No effect at all				A major effect	No opinion
a. Holding offenders more accountable	1	2	3	4	5	8
b. Making professionals/services more sensitive to the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the children and families they serve	1	2	3	4	5	8
c. Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect	1	2	3	4	5	8
d. Improving needs assessment for children/families	1	2	3	4	5	8
e. Improving case management and follow-up for families	1	2	3	4	5	8
f. Expanding prevention programs	1	2	3	4	5	8
g. Expanding early intervention programs	1	2	3	4	5	8
h. Expanding treatment services for victimized children	1	2	3	4	5	8
i. Expanding treatment services for juvenile sex offenders	1	2	3	4	5	8
j. Improving multi-agency responses to children affected by domestic violence	1	2	3	4	5	8
k. Improving services for children/families who might "fall through the cracks"	1	2	3	4	5	8
l. Reaching underserved rural areas	1	2	3	4	5	8
m. Involving grassroots organizations, religious organizations, and informal networks such as extended families in supporting children/families	1	2	3	4	5	8
n. Leveraging resources across public/private agencies to support children/families	1	2	3	4	5	8
o. Improving information-sharing and case tracking across agencies	1	2	3	4	5	8
p. Standardizing data collection across agencies	1	2	3	4	5	8
q. Evaluating local practices and outcomes	1	2	3	4	5	8
r. Educating community residents, including parents about child abuse and neglect	1	2	3	4	5	8
s. Decreasing community tolerance for child abuse and neglect	1	2	3	4	5	8

20. Looking back to Question 19, what do you consider the two most important accomplishments of [SK/SS Project] to date? Below, write in the letter from Question 19 that corresponds to each item.

_____
_____

Something else that is not listed? <Please specify>_____
_____

21. Overall, how satisfied are you with what [SK/SS Project] has accomplished so far? <Circle one.>

Not at all satisfied				Extremely satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

22. Community collaboratives typically face challenges in carrying out their goals and objectives. Have any of the following challenges been significant for [SK/SS Project]?

	Never significant	Significant earlier, but not now	Significant now	Always significant	Don't know
a. Turf issues (conflicting philosophies, interests, needs)	1	2	3	4	8
b. Limited resources	1	2	3	4	8
c. Ineffective leadership	1	2	3	4	8
d. Defining a realistic agenda	1	2	3	4	8
e. Lack of participation from key agencies or groups	1	2	3	4	8
f. Leadership/staff turnover in key agencies or groups	1	2	3	4	8
g. Understanding, meeting the expectations of funders	1	2	3	4	8
h. Keeping up the momentum	1	2	3	4	8
i. Other_____	1	2	3	4	8
j. Other_____	1	2	3	4	8

23. Federal funding for the [SK/SS Project] is expected to end in [year]. After Federal support ends, how likely is the [SK/SS Project] collaborative to continue in some form? <Circle one.>

Not at all likely				Extremely likely	No opinion
1	2	3	4	5	8

[Version for Huntsville, Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie]

24. Looking ahead to the coming year, how likely are you to be personally involved in [SK/SS Project]? <Circle one.>

Not at all likely				Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

[Version for Burlington & Toledo]

25. Assuming the [SK/SS Project] collaborative continues for the coming year, how likely are you to be personally involved in its activities? <Circle one.>

Not at all likely				Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

26. Compared to the past year, do you expect your level of involvement to be: <Check one only.>

r 1 Less r 2 About the same r 3 More

27. Is there anything that [SK/SS Project] could do to make it easier for you to participate?

r 1 Yes (Please explain)_____
r 2 No

28. We would welcome any other comments you have about your experience with [SK/SS Project]. Also, please feel free to expand on any of your answers to the questions above.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for your help!

Please send the questionnaire in the attached envelope. If you have misplaced the envelope forward the questionnaire to:

Westat
1650 Research Blvd, RW 2634
Rockville, MD 20850
Attn: Ann Kline

THANKS!!

APPENDIX C

Supporting Tables for the Third Stakeholder Survey

Table C-1. Stakeholder Ratings of Federal SK/SS Strategies and Dimensions of System Reform: Percentage Distributions

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Federal Safe Kids/Safe Streets strategies						
Ensuring a full range of services is available for child abuse and neglect, from prevention to treatment (N)	(69)	(62)	(53)	(52)	(28)	**(264)**
1 Not at all important	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	**0%**
2	0	2	6	2	0	**2**
3	4	6	8	17	7	**8**
4	17	32	30	31	43	**29**
5 Extremely important	78	60	57	48	50	**61**
Enhancing public awareness (N)	(69)	(62)	(53)	(53)	(27)	**(264)**
1 Not at all important	1%	0%	2%	2%	0%	**1%**
2	1	2	2	8	4	**3**
3	9	6	11	26	4	**12**
4	33	39	43	32	52	**38**
5 Extremely important	55	53	42	32	41	**46**
Improving information systems and evaluation to guide decisionmaking (N)	(68)	(62)	(56)	(53)	(28)	**(267)**
1 Not at all important	3%	0%	2%	2%	0%	**1%**
2	4	2	4	9	4	**4**
3	21	11	16	34	18	**20**
4	40	45	48	38	39	**42**
5 Extremely important	32	42	30	17	39	**32**
System reform (N)	(68)	(61)	(56)	(51)	(27)	**(263)**
1 Not at all important	3%	2%	0%	4%	0%	**2%**
2	3	5	7	12	15	**7**
3	21	25	14	29	48	**25**
4	38	36	27	37	19	**33**
5 Extremely important	35	33	52	18	19	**33**
Dimensions of system reform						
Increasing communication and partnerships among professionals/ agencies (N)	(68)	(60)	(54)	(51)	(30)	**(263)**
1 Not at all important	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	**1%**
2	1	2	6	4	0	**3**
3	4	5	9	25	10	**10**
4	28	28	31	31	43	**31**
5 Extremely important	66	65	54	35	47	**55**
Making the court process work more effectively (N)	(69)	(60)	(54)	(50)	(30)	**(263)**
1 Not at all important	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	**1%**
2	1	3	11	8	0	**5**
3	13	12	19	24	13	**16**
4	35	30	19	32	40	**30**
5 Extremely important	51	55	52	30	47	**48**

Table C-1. Stakeholder Ratings of Federal SK/SS Strategies and Dimensions of System Reform: Percentage Distributions (continued)

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Dimensions of system reform (continued)						
Increasing family involvement in decisionmaking (N)	(68)	(60)	(57)	(52)	(28)	**(265)**
1 Not at all important	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	**1%**
2	3	2	4	6	7	**4**
3	9	20	14	19	18	**15**
4	41	23	33	25	46	**33**
5 Extremely important	47	55	49	46	29	**47**
Increasing the cultural competency of agencies and staff (N)	(69)	(60)	(57)	(51)	(29)	**(266)**
1 Not at all important	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	**0%**
2	1	7	5	2	14	**5**
3	9	15	14	29	21	**17**
4	41	28	39	29	28	**34**
5 Extremely important	49	50	42	37	38	**44**
Improving cross-disciplinary training and skills (N)	(69)	(60)	(57)	(50)	(30)	**(266)**
1 Not at all important	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	**0%**
2	4	0	9	2	7	**4**
3	9	17	19	30	10	**17**
4	41	37	42	38	50	**41**
5 Extremely important	46	47	30	28	33	**38**
Increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement (N)	(69)	(60)	(54)	(50)	(29)	**(262)**
1 Not at all important	0%	0%	0%	6%	3%	**2%**
2	4	0	4	8	14	**5**
3	19	15	7	22	14	**16**
4	46	27	43	30	38	**37**
5 Extremely important	30	58	46	34	31	**41**
Increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions (N)	(69)	(60)	(54)	(52)	(30)	**(265)**
1 Not at all important	1%	2%	0%	2%	0%	**1%**
2	7	2	9	6	0	**5**
3	17	7	15	25	17	**16**
4	41	30	39	40	47	**38**
5 Extremely important	33	60	37	27	37	**39**
Reforming policies and procedures (N)	(67)	(60)	(57)	(51)	(30)	**(265)**
1 Not at all important	1%	3%	2%	4%	0%	**2%**
2	9	8	12	8	7	**9**
3	21	23	25	45	33	**28**
4	42	30	26	24	33	**31**
5 Extremely important	27	35	35	20	27	**29**

Table C-2. Mean Ratings of Federal SK/SS Strategies and Dimensions of System Reform: Respondents From Child Protection System vs. Other Respondents[1]

	Child Protection System[2] (N=64-68)	Other Respondents (N=196-202)	All Respondents (N=262-267)
Federal SK/SS Strategies			
Ensuring a full range of services is available, from prevention to treatment			
Burlington (N=69)	4.9	4.7	4.7
Huntsville (N=62)	4.4	4.5	4.5
Kansas City (N=53)	4.3	4.4	4.4
Sault Ste. Marie (N=52)	4.0	4.3	4.2
Toledo (N=28)	4.5	4.4	4.4
All Sites (N=264)	4.4	4.5	4.5
Enhancing public awareness			
Burlington (N=69)	4.3	4.4	4.4
Huntsville (N=62)	4.1	4.5	4.4
Kansas City (N=53)	4.2	4.2	4.2
Sault Ste. Marie (N=53)	3.5	3.9	3.8
Toledo (N=27)	4.4	4.2	4.3
All Sites (N=264)	4.1	4.3	4.2
Improving information systems and evaluation to guide decisionmaking			
Burlington (N=68)	3.8	4.0	3.9
Huntsville (N=61)	3.9	4.3	4.3
Kansas City (N=56)	3.7	4.2	4.0
Sault Ste. Marie (N=53)	3.2	3.7	3.6
Toledo (N=28)	4.1	4.2	4.1
All Sites (N=267)	**3.8**	**4.1**	**4.0**[w]
System reform			
Burlington (N=68)	3.9	4.0	4.0
Huntsville (N=61)	**3.3**	**4.0**	**3.9**[w]
Kansas City (N=56)	3.9	4.4	4.2
Sault Ste. Marie (N=51)	**2.8**	**3.7**	**3.5**[x]
Toledo (N=27)	3.4	3.5	3.4
All Sites (N=263)	**3.5**	**4.0**	**3.9**[x]
Dimensions of System Reform			
Increasing communication and partnerships among professionals/agencies			
Burlington (N=68)	4.6	4.6	4.6
Huntsville (N=60)	**3.9**	**4.7**	**4.6**[y]
Kansas City (N=54)	4.3	4.3	4.3
Sault Ste. Marie (N=51)	**3.3**	**4.1**	**3.9**[w]
Toledo (N=30)	4.3	4.5	4.4
All Sites (N=263)	**4.1**	**4.5**	**4.4**[x]
Making the court process work more effectively			
Burlington (N=69)	4.4	4.3	4.3
Huntsville (N=60)	**3.8**	**4.5**	**4.4**[w]
Kansas City (N=54)	3.9	4.2	4.1
Sault Ste. Marie (N=50)	**3.1**	**3.9**	**3.7**[w]
Toledo (N=30)	4.5	4.1	4.3
All Sites (N=263)	4.0	4.2	4.2

Table C-2. Mean Ratings of Federal SK/SS Strategies and Dimensions of System Reform: Respondents From Child Protection System vs. Other Respondents[1] (continued)

	Child Protection System[2] (N=64-68)	Other Respondents (N=196-202)	All Respondents (N=262-267)
Increasing family involvement in decisionmaking			
Burlington (N=68)	4.4	4.3	4.3
Huntsville (N=60)	**3.4**	**4.5**	**4.3[y]**
Kansas City (N=57)	4.0	4.4	4.3
Sault Ste. Marie (N=52)	3.5	4.2	4.0
Toledo (N=28)	4.1	3.8	4.0
All Sites (N=265)	**3.9**	**4.3**	**4.2[x]**
Increasing the cultural competency of agencies and staff			
Burlington (N=69)	4.5	4.4	4.4
Huntsville (N=60)	**3.2**	**4.4**	**4.2[y]**
Kansas City (N=57)	**3.7**	**4.4**	**4.2[x]**
Sault Ste. Marie (N=51)	**3.5**	**4.1**	**4.0[w]**
Toledo (N=29)	4.1	3.6	3.9
All Sites (N=266)	**3.8**	**4.3**	**4.2[y]**
Improving cross-disciplinary training and skills			
Burlington (N=69)	4.5	4.2	4.3
Huntsville (N=60)	4.0	4.4	4.3
Kansas City (N=57)	3.8	4.0	3.9
Sault Ste. Marie (N=50)	3.6	3.9	3.9
Toledo (N=30)	4.1	4.1	4.1
All Sites (N=266)	4.0	4.2	4.1
Increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement			
Burlington (N=69)	4.2	4.0	4.0
Huntsville (N=60)	**3.9**	**4.5**	**4.3[w]**
Kansas City (N=54)	4.1	4.4	4.3
Sault Ste. Marie (N=50)	3.4	3.9	3.8
Toledo (N=29)	3.7	3.9	3.8
All Sites (N=262)	**3.9**	**4.2**	**4.1[w]**
Increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions			
Burlington (N=69)	4.2	3.9	4.0
Huntsville (N=60)	**3.6**	**4.6**	**4.5[y]**
Kansas City (N=54)	3.8	4.2	4.0
Sault Ste. Marie (N=52)	**3.2**	**4.0**	**3.8[x]**
Toledo (N=30)	4.3	4.1	4.2
All Sites (N=265)	**3.8**	**4.2**	**4.1[x]**

Table C-2. Mean Ratings of Federal SK/SS Strategies and Dimensions of System Reform: Respondents From Child Protection System vs. Other Respondents[1] (continued)

	Child Protection System[2] (N=64-68)	**Other Respondents** (N=196-202)	**All Respondents** (N=262-267)
Reforming policies and procedures			
Burlington (N=67)	3.8	3.8	3.8
Huntsville (N=60)	**3.0**	**4.0**	**3.9**[x]
Kansas City (N=57)	3.6	3.9	3.8
Sault Ste. Marie (N=51)	**2.7**	**3.7**	**3.5**[x]
Toledo (N=30)	3.6	4.0	3.8
All Sites (N=265)	**3.4**	**3.9**	**3.8**[x]

[1] Respondents ranked strategies on a 5-point scale, where "1" stands for "Not at all important" and "5" stands for "Extremely important." Statistically significant findings are shown in bold.

[2] This includes respondents who identified themselves as representing child protective services, law enforcement, prosecution, or Family Court agencies.

Significance levels of F:

w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.

x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

Table C-3. Mean Ratings of Involvement: Respondents From Organizations Who Received SK/SS Funds vs. Respondents From Organizations That Did Not Receive Funds[1]

Site	Received SK/SS Funds	Did Not Receive SK/SS Funds
Burlington (N)	(30-31)	(35-37)
Hours spent per month in past year	4.0	5.2
No. of meetings in past year	12.1	9.5
No. of types of involvement	2.5	1.9
Huntsville (N)	(19)	(38-41)
Hours spent per month in past year	6.8	4.0
No. of meetings in past year	**14.4**	**5.3**[w]
No. of types of involvement	**3.4**	**1.6**[z]
Kansas City (N)	(20-22)	(31-32)
Hours spent per month in past year	3.4	4.9
No. of meetings in past year	3.3	4.7
No. of types of involvement	1.6	1.8
Sault Ste. Marie (N)	(11-13)	(36-41)
Hours spent per month in past year	3.3	8.3
No. of meetings in past year	5.4	4.9
No. of types of involvement	2.2	1.9
Toledo	(12)	(17)
Hours spent per month in past year	5.4	3.2
No. of meetings in past year	21.6	14.9
No. of types of involvement	**3.9**	**2.4**[w]
All sites	(93-97)	(158-168)
Hours spent per month in past year	5.3	4.6
No. of meetings in past year	**11.0**	**7.0**[w]
No. of types of involvement	**2.6**	**1.9**[z]

[1] Statistically significant differences are shown in bold.

Significance levels of F:

w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.

x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

Table C-4. Stakeholder Assessments of the SK/SS Implementation Process: Percentage Distributions

Thinking of SK/SS over the past year, how satisfied are you with…	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	All Sites
Leadership and Communication						
Leadership provided by the SK/SS grantee and staff? (N)	(67)	(61)	(50)	(47)	(25)	**(250)**
1 Not at all satisfied	1%	0%	4%	4%	0%	**2%**
2	3	0	4	4	0	**2**
3	3	11	16	28	24	**14**
4	33	28	14	36	28	**28**
5 Extremely satisfied	60	61	62	28	48	**53**
Advanced notice of meetings? (N)	(62)	(55)	(48)	(46)	(24)	**(235)**
1 Not at all satisfied	0%	2%	0%	2%	0%	**1%**
2	2	0	0	7	0	**2**
3	8	11	6	24	13	**12**
4	27	35	25	46	42	**34**
5 Extremely satisfied	63	53	69	22	46	**52**
Communication between project staff and other SK/SS participants? (N)	(59)	(53)	(43)	(46)	(25)	**(226)**
1 Not at all satisfied	2%	0%	7%	4%	0%	**3%**
2	2	2	7	9	0	**4**
3	8	9	5	28	8	**12**
4	37	36	33	30	56	**37**
5 Extremely satisfied	51	53	49	28	36	**45**
Communication among SK/SS participants? (N)	(52)	(51)	(49)	(45)	(26)	**(223)**
1 Not at all satisfied	2%	2%	6%	2%	4%	**3%**
2	2	2	10	13	4	**6**
3	15	18	8	31	23	**18**
4	44	35	39	33	38	**38**
5 Extremely satisfied	37	43	37	20	31	**34**
Convenience of Meetings						
Convenience of meeting times? (N)	(61)	(58)	(48)	(47)	(25)	**(239)**
1 Not at all satisfied	0%	2%	0%	6%	4%	**2%**
2	10	3	6	9	0	**6**
3	18	28	10	30	24	**22**
4	52	31	33	36	36	**38**
5 Extremely satisfied	20	36	50	19	36	**31**
Decisionmaking Process						
The process of deciding on SK/SS programs and priorities? (N)	(42)	(40)	(43)	(37)	(23)	**(185)**
1 Not at all satisfied	2%	3%	7%	8%	4%	**5%**
2	7	0	12	14	0	**7**
3	14	8	14	30	26	**17**
4	33	38	19	30	52	**32**
5 Extremely satisfied	43	53	49	19	17	**38**

Table C-4. Stakeholder Assessments of the SK/SS Implementation Process: Percentage Distributions (continued)

Thinking of SK/SS over the past year, how satisfied are you with…	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	All Sites
Decisions Made						
Decision made on SK/SS priorities? (N)	(45)	(49)	(44)	(41)	(22)	**(201)**
1 Not at all satisfied	0%	4%	2%	5%	0%	**2%**
2	4	4	11	17	5	**8**
3	13	6	14	17	23	**13**
4	36	45	25	37	50	**37**
5 Extremely satisfied	47	41	48	24	23	**38**
Decisions made about which community programs to fund? (N)	(44)	(44)	(45)	(34)	(20)	**(187)**
1 Not at all satisfied	0%	5%	4%	3%	0%	**3%**
2	2	2	7	21	0	**6**
3	20	14	9	24	30	**18**
4	30	30	33	38	45	**34**
5 Extremely satisfied	48	50	47	15	25	**40**
Decisions about how and what aspects of SK/SS will be sustained? (N)	(40)	(39)	(46)	(38)	(20)	**(183)**
1 Not at all satisfied	3%	5%	4%	11%	5%	**5%**
2	0	5	11	11	0	**6**
3	28	0	15	42	25	**21**
4	33	41	28	26	40	**33**
5 Extremely satisfied	38	49	41	11	30	**34**

Table C-5. Stakeholders Reporting Changes in Their Own Organizations Resulting From SK/SS: Percentage Distributions

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	All Sites
Thinking just of your own organization, has involvement in Safe Kids/Safe Streets…						
Improved communication with other organizations? (N)	(59)	(53)	(50)	(48)	(23)	**(233)**
1 Not at all	10%	11%	8%	15%	13%	**11%**
2	5	6	10	17	13	**9**
3	17	17	38	31	13	**24**
4	49	28	24	23	30	**32**
5 A great deal	19	38	20	15	30	**24**
Mean rating	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.1	3.5	**3.5**
Improved communication with community members? (N)	(58)	(53)	(50)	(47)	(24)	**(232)**
1 Not at all	17%	11%	14%	15%	8%	**14%**
2	10	6	14	17	17	**12**
3	14	23	34	26	25	**24**
4	45	30	16	21	29	**29**
5 A great deal	14	30	22	21	21	**22**
Mean rating	3.3	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.4	**3.3**
Improved training/professional development? (N)	(60)	(52)	(46)	(47)	(24)	**(229)**
1 Not at all	15%	17%	28%	19%	4%	**18%**
2	13	10	11	13	13	**12**
3	25	10	33	34	29	**25**
4	38	33	20	19	38	**29**
5 A great deal	8	31	9	15	17	**16**
Mean rating	3.1	3.5	2.7	3.0	3.5	**3.1**[w]
Expanded the scope of services/activities? (N)	(59)	(39)	(32)	(32)	(17)	**(179)**
1 Not at all	17%	31%	31%	25%	12%	**23%**
2	15	15	25	19	24	**18**
3	17	13	9	22	12	**15**
4	39	31	13	25	35	**30**
5 A great deal	12	10	22	9	18	**13**
Mean rating	3.1	2.7	2.7	2.8	3.2	**2.9**
Increased the amount or quality of information available for making decisions? (N)	(59)	(49)	(45)	(48)	(23)	**(224)**
1 Not at all	14%	18%	24%	21%	13%	**18%**
2	19	12	22	15	13	**17**
3	25	14	29	31	30	**25**
4	39	35	16	17	22	**27**
5 A great deal	3	20	9	17	22	**13**
Mean rating	3.0	3.3	2.6	2.9	3.3	**3.0**

Table C-5. Stakeholders Reporting Changes in Their Own Organizations Resulting From SK/SS: Percentage Distributions (continued)

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	All Sites
Thinking just of your own organization, has involvement in Safe Kids/Safe Streets… (continued)						
Changed how your agency communicates with other agencies or organizations? (N)	(60)	(52)	(46)	(47)	(24)	**(229)**
1 Not at all	20%	19%	22%	17%	4%	**18%**
2	18	10	11	23	25	**17**
3	28	21	39	28	33	**29**
4	25	29	22	26	21	**25**
5 A great deal	8	21	7	6	17	**11**
Mean rating	2.8	3.2	2.8	2.8	3.2	**3.0**
Made your agency more accessible to cultural/ethnic minorities? (N)	(51)	(50)	(36)	(46)	(21)	**(204)**
1 Not at all	29%	24%	44%	13%	29%	**27%**
2	22	4	11	20	14	**14**
3	25	24	14	26	29	**24**
4	16	32	17	13	29	**21**
5 A great deal	8	16	14	28	0	**15**
Mean rating	2.5	3.1	2.4	3.2	2.6	**2.8**[w]
Improved communication with clients? (N)	(54)	(46)	(46)	(45)	(20)	**(211)**
1 Not at all	24%	20%	33%	24%	10%	**24%**
2	22	4	11	13	30	**15**
3	20	26	33	29	35	**27**
4	26	24	13	18	10	**19**
5 A great deal	7	26	11	16	15	**15**
Mean rating	2.7	3.3	2.6	2.9	2.9	**2.9**
Increased money/staff available for services? (N)	(50)	(33)	(30)	(30)	(17)	**(160)**
1 Not at all	36%	55%	43%	53%	35%	**44%**
2	10	3	20	13	24	**13**
3	14	15	10	13	12	**13**
4	34	21	20	17	24	**24**
5 A great deal	6	6	7	3	6	**6**
Mean rating	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.0	2.4	**2.3**
Changed your routine procedures? (N)	(55)	(50)	(46)	(51)	(22)	**(224)**
1 Not at all	27%	30%	37%	27%	9%	**28%**
2	24	20	20	27	14	**22**
3	29	22	30	29	41	**29**
4	18	26	11	16	32	**19**
5 A great deal	2	2	2	0	5	**2**
Mean rating	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.3	3.1	**2.4**[w]

Table C-5. Stakeholders Reporting Changes in Their Own Organizations Resulting From SK/SS: Percentage Distributions (continued)

	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	All Sites
Thinking just of your own organization, has involvement in Safe Kids/Safe Streets… (continued)						
Increased caseloads? (N)	(46)	(35)	(31)	(27)	(14)	**(153)**
1 Not at all	50%	63%	55%	56%	43%	**54%**
2	20	11	16	19	14	**16**
3	17	11	16	11	14	**14**
4	11	14	10	15	21	**13**
5 A great deal	2	0	3	0	7	**2**
Mean rating	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.4	**1.9**
Altered staffing assignments? (N)	(50)	(46)	(44)	(49)	(22)	**(211)**
1 Not at all	42%	50%	36%	33%	23%	**38%**
2	26	15	20	22	41	**23**
3	18	20	32	31	9	**23**
4	14	13	7	12	18	**12**
5 A great deal	0	2	5	2	9	**3**
Mean rating	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.5	**2.2**
Changed your budget priorities? (N)	(47)	(45)	(41)	(41)	(19)	**(193)**
1 Not at all	53%	47%	39%	54%	32%	**47%**
2	17	18	22	17	11	**18**
3	23	27	27	27	26	**26**
4	6	4	10	2	16	**7**
5 A great deal	0	4	2	0	16	**3**
Mean rating	1.8	2.0	2.1	1.8	2.7	**2.0**[w]
Lowered caseloads? (N)	(47)	(33)	(33)	(27)	(11)	**(151)**
1 Not at all	81%	88%	76%	78%	73%	**80%**
2	6	12	21	7	9	**11**
3	11	0	3	15	9	**7**
4	2	0	0	0	0	**1**
5 A great deal	0	0	0	0	9	**1**
Mean rating	1.3	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.6	**1.3**

Significance levels of F:
w = p ≤ .05. y = p ≤ .001.
x = p ≤ .01. z = p ≤ .0001.

Table C-6. Stakeholder Assessments of SK/SS Effects on Federal Program Objectives

The Federal SK/SS program has many goals and objectives related to child abuse and neglect. Not all sites are placing the same emphasis on each one. So far in your community, do you believe SK/SS has had any effect on:	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
System Reform and Accountability						
Improving communication/cooperation among those who deal with child abuse and neglect (N)	(67)	(59)	(52)	(48)	(28)	**(254)**
1 No effect at all	1%	2%	4%	4%	4%	**3%**
2	0	2	6	8	7	**4**
3	15	14	23	27	14	**19**
4	46	36	33	42	39	**39**
5 A major effect	37	47	35	19	36	**35**
Mean rating	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.6	4.0	**4.0[x]**
Improving multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence (N)	(57)	(53)	(48)	(43)	(25)	**(226)**
1 No effect at all	2%	2%	4%	7%	0%	**3%**
2	5	2	15	16	8	**9**
3	25	17	23	16	28	**21**
4	40	30	31	42	44	**37**
5 A major effect	28	49	27	19	20	**30**
Mean rating	3.9	4.2	3.6	3.5	3.8	**3.8[x]**
Improving needs assessment for children/ families (N)	(53)	(55)	(46)	(45)	(25)	**(224)**
1 No effect at all	6%	0%	7%	7%	0%	**4%**
2	9	7	11	16	12	**11**
3	28	18	35	27	24	**26**
4	40	40	35	38	40	**38**
5 A major effect	17	35	13	13	24	**21**
Mean rating	3.5	4.0	3.4	3.4	3.8	**3.6[x]**
Making professionals/services more sensitive to the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the children and families they served (N)	(61)	(57)	(47)	(47)	(27)	**(239)**
1 No effect at all	3%	0%	11%	2%	4%	**4%**
2	16	0	13	13	19	**11**
3	34	16	32	23	26	**26**
4	41	39	32	45	44	**40**
5 A major effect	5	46	13	17	7	**19**
Mean rating	3.3	4.3	3.2	3.6	3.3	**3.6[z]**

Table C-6. Stakeholder Assessments of SK/SS Effects on Federal Program Objectives (continued)

The Federal SK/SS program has many goals and objectives related to child abuse and neglect. Not all sites are placing the same emphasis on each one. So far in your community, do you believe SK/SS has had any effect on:	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Improving case management and followup for families (N)	(59)	(46)	(48)	(41)	(27)	**(221)**
1 No effect at all	3%	0%	8%	10%	0%	**5%**
2	7	11	15	15	7	**11**
3	34	20	38	24	26	**29**
4	34	50	27	46	56	**41**
5 A major effect	22	20	13	5	11	**15**
Mean rating	3.6	3.8	3.2	3.2	3.7	**3.5[x]**
Leveraging resources across public/ private agencies to support children/ families (N)	(59)	(53)	(44)	(40)	(24)	**(220)**
1 No effect at all	5%	4%	11%	10%	8%	**7%**
2	19	6	11	20	17	**14**
3	29	23	23	35	38	**28**
4	42	40	36	30	25	**36**
5 A major effect	5	28	18	5	13	**14**
Mean rating	3.2	3.8	3.4	3.0	3.2	**3.4[x]**
Involving grassroots organizations, religious organizations, and informal networks such as extended families in supporting children/families (N)	(53)	(50)	(50)	(46)	(24)	**(223)**
1 No effect at all	8%	0%	8%	13%	8%	**7%**
2	30	10	6	26	38	**20**
3	28	26	34	28	29	**29**
4	26	38	26	17	21	**26**
5 A major effect	8	26	26	15	4	**17**
Mean rating	3.0	3.8	3.6	3.0	2.8	**3.3[z]**
Holding offenders more accountable (N)	(45)	(42)	(38)	(40)	(25)	**(190)**
1 No effect at all	18%	2%	18%	23%	16%	**15%**
2	18	7	21	40	28	**22**
3	24	33	32	18	16	**25**
4	38	33	21	18	28	**28**
5 A major effect	2	24	8	3	12	**9**
Mean rating	2.9	3.7	2.8	2.4	2.9	**2.9[z]**
Expanding the Continuum of Services						
Expanding prevention programs (N)	(58)	(52)	(46)	(46)	(26)	**(228)**
1 No effect at all	5%	0%	7%	9%	4%	**5%**
2	7	8	9	11	8	**8**
3	24	27	24	30	27	**26**
4	41	25	30	35	35	**33**
5 A major effect	22	40	30	15	27	**27**
Mean rating	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.4	3.7	**3.7**

Table C-6. Stakeholder Assessments of SK/SS Effects on Federal Program Objectives (continued)

The Federal SK/SS program has many goals and objectives related to child abuse and neglect. Not all sites are placing the same emphasis on each one. So far in your community, do you believe SK/SS has had any effect on:	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Improving services for children/families who might "fall through the cracks" (N)	(59)	(50)	(50)	(45)	(22)	**(226)**
1 No effect at all	5%	4%	8%	11%	0%	**6%**
2	7	8	14	16	23	**12**
3	31	18	28	24	27	**26**
4	37	46	34	33	41	**38**
5 A major effect	20	24	16	16	9	**18**
Mean rating	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.4	**3.5**
Expanding treatment services for victimized children (N)	(52)	(48)	(47)	(46)	(25)	**(218)**
1 No effect at all	4%	2%	9%	7%	0%	**5%**
2	10	6	15	22	4	**12**
3	31	15	38	33	24	**28**
4	38	38	23	24	40	**32**
5 A major effect	17	40	15	15	32	**23**
Mean rating	3.6	4.1	3.2	3.2	4.0	**3.6[z]**
Expanding early intervention programs (N)	(53)	(50)	(46)	(45)	(25)	**(219)**
1 No effect at all	0%	0%	7%	9%	4%	**4%**
2	11	10	15	16	16	**13**
3	32	32	24	38	20	**30**
4	43	28	35	29	32	**34**
5 A major effect	13	30	20	9	28	**19**
Mean rating	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.1	3.6	**3.5[w]**
Expanding treatment services for juvenile sex offenders (N)	(43)	(35)	(43)	(39)	(22)	**(182)**
1 No effect at all	9%	0%	21%	23%	0%	**12%**
2	14	20	9	18	32	**17**
3	40	34	40	36	32	**37**
4	23	17	16	15	32	**20**
5 A major effect	14	29	14	8	5	**14**
Mean rating	3.2	3.5	2.9	2.7	3.1	**3.1[w]**
Reaching underserved rural areas (N)	(39)	(33)	(37)	(47)	(22)	**(178)**
1 No effect at all	10%	3%	49%	6%	36%	**19%**
2	26	21	16	13	27	**20**
3	33	30	16	30	23	**27**
4	21	33	8	30	9	**21**
5 A major effect	10	12	11	21	5	**13**
Mean rating	2.9	3.3	2.2	3.5	2.2	**2.9[z]**

Table C-6. Stakeholder Assessments of SK/SS Effects on Federal Program Objectives (continued)

The Federal SK/SS program has many goals and objectives related to child abuse and neglect. Not all sites are placing the same emphasis on each one. So far in your community, do you believe SK/SS has had any effect on:	Burlington	Huntsville	Kansas City	Sault Ste. Marie	Toledo	**All Sites**
Data Collection and Local Evaluation						
Improving information-sharing and case tracking across agencies (N)	(62)	(48)	(47)	(45)	(29)	**(231)**
1 No effect at all	3%	4%	4%	7%	0%	**4%**
2	10	8	15	24	7	**13**
3	21	19	28	29	17	**23**
4	48	31	32	31	34	**36**
5 A major effect	18	38	21	9	41	**24**
Mean rating	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.1	4.1	**3.6[y]**
Evaluating local practices and outcomes (N)	(55)	(44)	(48)	(41)	(26)	**(214)**
1 No effect at all	4%	7%	6%	12%	0%	**6%**
2	15	7	19	22	15	**15**
3	29	16	23	39	35	**28**
4	38	43	31	24	31	**34**
5 A major effect	15	27	21	2	19	**17**
Mean rating	3.5	3.8	3.4	2.8	3.5	**3.4[x]**
Standardizing data collection across agencies (N)	(47)	(42)	(46)	(39)	(28)	**(202)**
1 No effect at all	19%	12%	13%	15%	0%	**13%**
2	23	12	20	36	25	**23**
3	32	26	35	31	14	**29**
4	19	26	20	15	36	**22**
5 A major effect	6	24	13	3	25	**13**
Mean rating	2.7	3.4	3.0	2.5	3.6	**3.0[y]**
Prevention Education and Public Awareness						
Educating community residents, including parents, about child abuse and neglect (N)	(63)	(54)	(46)	(49)	(25)	**(237)**
1 No effect at all	2%	2%	7%	6%	4%	**4%**
2	16	6	13	6	12	**11**
3	22	19	24	37	20	**24**
4	43	37	35	33	44	**38**
5 A major effect	17	37	22	18	20	**23**
Mean rating	3.6	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.6	**3.7**
Decreasing community tolerance for child abuse and neglect (N)	(58)	(52)	(47)	(46)	(27)	**(230)**
1 No effect at all	7%	2%	13%	9%	7%	**7%**
2	14	8	13	15	11	**12**
3	28	17	26	33	33	**27**
4	33	33	32	24	15	**29**
5 A major effect	19	40	17	20	33	**25**
Mean rating	3.4	4.0	3.3	3.3	3.6	**3.5[x]**

Significance levels of F:
w = $p \leq .05$. y = $p \leq .001$.
x = $p \leq .01$. z = $p \leq .0001$.

Table C-7. Factors Related to Stakeholder Satisfaction with SK/SS Decisionmaking and Accomplishments: Overall and By Site

	Overall Satisfaction with Accomplishments So Far[1]					
	All	B	H	KC	SSM	T
Job Characteristics						
Agency type						
- Formal child protection system vs. other agencies[2]					-	
- Public agency vs. all others			+			
- Private provider/agency vs. all others		-				
Level of authority to make decisions in own agency						+
Organizational Involvement in SK/SS						
Organization received funds from SK/SS						
Organization contributed staff to SK/SS activities						
Adequacy of time respondent's organization contributed			-			
Ratings of Importance of Federal SK/SS Strategies for Own Community						
Ensuring a full range of services, from prevention to treatment	+					+
Enhancing public awareness	+		+			
Improving information systems and evaluation	+		+		+	
System reform	+		+			
Ratings of Importance of System Reform Dimensions						
Increasing communication and partnerships among agencies	+		+		+	
Increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement	+	+	+			
Improving cross-disciplinary training and skills	+	+	+			
Increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions	+		+		+	
Making the court process work more effectively	+	+				
Increasing the cultural competence of agencies and staff	+		+			
Increasing family involvement in decisionmaking	+	+	+			
Reforming policies and procedures	+		+			
Personal Involvement in SK/SS						
Served on Council or governing body						
Implemented activities/efforts funded by SK/SS				+		
No. of types of involvement	+		+		+	+
Hours per month in SK/SS meetings or other activities	+			+	+	
No. of meetings attended in past year	+	+		+	+	+
Adequacy of time respondent contributed						
Ratings of Stakeholder Influence						
Openness to different points of view	+	+	+	+	+	+
Influence over						
- Overall goals and objectives	+	+	+	+	+	+
- Funding decisions	+			+	+	
- Program operations	+	+		+	+	

Table C-7. Factors Related to Stakeholder Satisfaction With SK/SS Decisionmaking and Accomplishments: Overall and By Site (continued)

	Overall Satisfaction with Accomplishments So Far[1]					
	All	B	H	KC	SSM	T
Satisfaction with Implementation Process						
Leadership provided by grantee and staff	+	+	+	+	+	+
Communication between staff and other participants	+	+	+	+	+	+
Communication among SK/SS participants	+	+	+	+	+	+
Process for deciding on SK/SS programs and priorities	+	+	+	+	+	+
Satisfaction with Decisions						
Decisions made on SK/SS priorities	+	+	+	+	+	+
Decisions about which community programs to fund	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ratings of Adequacy of Resources Involved						
Adequacy of resources available to SK/SS						
Adequacy of data available to guide decisions	+		+	+	+	
Adequacy of effort spent on strategic planning						
Adequacy of guidance and TA from Federal sponsors					+	
Adequacy of involvement by professionals and agencies	+		+		+	
Adequacy of community involvement	+		+	+	+	
Adequacy of cultural/ethnic diversity of participants	+			+	+	
Effects of SK/SS So Far						
No. of personal benefits reported	+		+			+
No. of large changes on own organization	+	+	+	+	+	+
Significantly affected operations within own organization, overall	+	+	+	+	+	+
Significantly affected children and families served by own organization, overall	+	+	+	+	+	+
No. of strong effects on community	+	+	+	+	+	+

[1] Key to symbols:

+ indicates Spearman correlation coefficient that was significant at the .05 level or less.

– indicates an inverse correlation that was significant at the .05 level or less. An inverse correlation signifies that higher ratings on one variable are related to lower ratings on the other variable, or the absence of that characteristic (as in comparisons of agency type).

[2] This includes respondents who identified themselves as representing child protective services, law enforcement, prosecution, or court agencies.

Table C-8. Relationship Between Expected Future Involvement in SK/SS and Other Factors: Overall and By Site

	Likelihood of Involvement Next Year[1]						Extent of Expected Involvement[1]					
	All	B	H	KC	SSM	T	All	B	H	KC	SSM	T
Job Characteristics												
Agency type												
- Formal child protection system vs. other agencies[2]						-						
- Public agency vs. all others						-						
- Private provider/agency vs. all others						+						
Level of authority to make decisions in own agency												
Organizational Involvement in SK/SS												
Organization received funds from SK/SS												
Organization contributed staff to SK/SS activities	+					+						
Adequacy of time respondent's organization contributed							-	-	-			
Ratings of Importance of Federal SK/SS Strategies for Own Community												
Ensuring a full range of services, from prevention to treatment	+			+					+			
Enhancing public awareness	+	+	+		+						+	+
Improving information systems and evaluation	+	+	+		+		+		+			+
System reform	+			+	+		+					
Ratings of Importance of System Reform Dimensions												
Increasing communication and partnerships among agencies	+	+	+	+				+		+		
Increasing citizen and neighborhood involvement	+	+	+						+			
Improving cross-disciplinary training and skills	+	+	+	+					+			
Increasing the availability of data on which to base decisions	+	+	+			+	+		+			
Making the court process work more effectively	+	+		+			+	+	+	+		
Increasing the cultural competence of agencies and staff	+	+					+		+			+
Increasing family involvement in decisionmaking	+	+					+	+	+			
Reforming policies and procedures	+		+	+								

Table C-8. Relationship Between Expected Future Involvement in SK/SS and Other Factors: Overall and By Site (continued)

	Likelihood of Involvement Next Year[1]						Extent of Expected Involvement[1]					
	All	B	H	KC	SSM	T	All	B	H	KC	SSM	T
Personal Involvement in SK/SS												
Types of involvement												
- Served on Council or governing body	+											
- Served on another project committee, team, or task force	+	+		+	+	+						
- Attended community meetings convened by SK/SS	+	+	+		+	+						+
- Helped develop training or made presentations	+	+			+	+						
- Implemented activities/efforts funded by SK/SS	+			+	+			+				
No. of types of involvement	+	+	+	+	+	+						
Hours per month in SK/SS meetings or other activities	+			+	+	+					+	
No. of meetings attended in past year	+	+	+	+	+	+				+		
Difficulty of making time to participate	-		-	-	-							-
Adequacy of time respondent contributed					+		-			+		
Ratings of Stakeholder Influence												
Openness to different points of view	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+		
Influence over												
- Overall goals and objectives	+	+		+	+		+			+		
- Funding decisions	+	+		+	+		+			+		
- Program operations	+	+		+	+		+			+		
Satisfaction with Implementation Process												
Leadership provided by grantee and staff	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+		
Advance notice for meetings	+	+		+	+		+		+			+
Communication between staff and other participants	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	
Communication among SK/SS participants	+	+	+	+	+							
Convenience of meeting times	+	+		+	+		+					
Process for deciding on SK/SS programs and priorities	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+		

Table C-8. Relationship Between Expected Future Involvement in SK/SS and Other Factors: Overall and By Site (continued)

	Likelihood of Involvement Next Year[1]						Extent of Expected Involvement[1]					
	All	B	H	KC	SSM	T	All	B	H	KC	SSM	T
Satisfaction with Decisions and Accomplishments												
Decisions made on SK/SS priorities	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+	+	+
Decisions about which community programs to fund	+	+	+	+	+		+		+			
Decisions about how and what aspects of SK/SS to sustain	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+	+	
Overall satisfaction with accomplishments	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		
Effects of SK/SS So Far												
No. of personal benefits reported	+	+	+	+	+	+						
No. of large changes in own organization	+	+	+	+	+				+		+	
No. of strong effects on community	+	+	+	+	+		+			+	+	
Significantly affected operations within own organization, overall	+	+	+	+	+		+			+	+	
Significantly affected children and families served by own organization, overall	+	+	+	+	+							

[1] Key to symbols:

\+ indicates Spearman correlation coefficient that was significant at the .05 level or less.

− indicates an inverse correlation that was significant at the .05 level or less. An inverse correlation signifies that higher ratings on one variable are related to lower ratings on the other variable, or the absence of that characteristic (as in comparisons of agency type).

[2] This includes respondents who identified themselves as representing child protective services, law enforcement, prosecution, or court agencies.